DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 815 UD 023 452

TITLE	Women and Children in Poverty. Hearing before the Task Force on Entitlements, Uncontrollables, and Indexing of the Committee on the Budget. House of Representatives, Ninety-Eighth Congress, First Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on the Budget.
PUB DATE	27 Oct 83
NOTE	114p.; Some sections have light print.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Black Family; *Children; *Federal Programs; *Females; Financial Support; Government Role; Nutrition; Older Adults; One Parent Family; *Poverty; Program Effectiveness; Program Improvement; Social Services; Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS	Aid to Families with Dependent Children; *Entitlement Programs; Food Stamp Program; Medicaid; *Reagan Administration

ABSTRACT

This hearing focused on the impact of Reagan Administration budget policies on women and children, especially in entitlement programs such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children, food stamps, Medicaid, child nutrition, and social services. Oral testimony describing their own experiences and opinions was given by four female participants in the welfare system. Oral and prepared statements offering suggestions for program improvements were presented by Harriette McAdoo of the Howard University School of Social Work; Eleanor Holmes Norton, Georgetown University Law Center; and Barbara Blum of the Manpower Research Demonstration Project. Norton also submitted for the record part of a report ("A Policy Framework for Racial Justice") by the Tarrytown group of black scholars, and McAdoo submitted a summary of her report on the "Extended Family Support of Single Black Mothers." (CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

03/26/84

WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN POVERTY

UD

ED242815

UD023452

HEARING

BEFORE THE

TASK FORCE ON ENTITLEMENTS, UNCONTROLLABLES, AND INDEXING

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

OCTOBER 27, 1983

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Budget

Serial No. TF8-8

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE ✓

27-430 O

WASHINGTON : 1984

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

JAMES R. JONES, Oklahoma, *Chairman*

JIM WRIGHT, Texas
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
TIMOTHY E. WIRTH, Colorado
LEON E. PANETTA, California
RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Missouri
BILL NELSON, Florida
LES ASPIN, Wisconsin
W. G. (BILL) HEFNER, North Carolina
THOMAS J. DOWNEY, New York
BRIAN J. DONNELLY, Massachusetts
MIKE LOWRY, Washington
BUTLER DERRICK, South Carolina
GEORGE MILLER, California
WILLIAM H. GRAY III, Pennsylvania
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
GERALDINE A. FERRARO, New York
HOWARD WOLPE, Michigan
MARTIN FROST, Texas
VIC FAZIO, California

DELBERT L. LATTA, Ohio
BUD SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
BILL FRENZEL, Minnesota
JACK KEMP, New York
ED BETHUNE, Arkansas
PHIL GRAMM, Texas
LYNN MARTIN, Illinois
BOBBI FIEDLER, California
WILLIS D. GRADISON, Jr., Ohio
TOM LOEFFLER, Texas
CONNIE MACK, Florida

Mace Broide, *Executive Director*
John C. Dill, *Deputy Executive Director*
Wendell Belew, *Chief Counsel*
James A. Clifton, *Minority Staff Director*

Task Force on Entitlements, Uncontrollables, and Indexing

BRIAN J. DONNELLY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

JAMES R. JONES, Oklahoma
JIM WRIGHT, Texas
W. G. (BILL) HEFNER, North Carolina
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
GERALDINE FERRARO, New York
VIC FAZIO, California

DELBERT L. LATTA, Ohio
PHIL GRAMM, Texas
WILLIS D. GRADISON, Jr., Ohio
CONNIE MACK, Florida

James A. Rotherham, *Associate Director for Human Resources*
LaVarne Taylor, *Analyst*
Martha Casey, *Administrator*

CONTENTS

Page

Statements of:
- Baker, Kathy, Annapolis, Md 10
- Blum, Barbara B., president, Manpower Research Demonstration Corp., New York, N.Y 89
- McAdoo, Harriette, Ph.D., professor, research sequence, School of Social Work, Howard University 73
- Mobley, Sadie, Washington, D.C 7
- Murphy, Suzanne, Boston, Mass 5
- Norton, Eleanor Holmes, professor, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, D.C 30
- Shepard, Anita, New York, N.Y 9

Additional information submitted for the record by:
- Blum, Barbara B., prepared statement 92
- McAdoo, Dr. Harriett:
  - Extended Family Support of Single Black Mothers Final Report 104
  - Prepared statement 79
- Norton, Eleanor Holmes, prepared statement with attachment entitled: A Policy Framework for Racial Justice 37

WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN POVERTY

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1983

House of Representatives,
Task Force on Entitlements,
Uncontrollables, and Indexing,
Committee on the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

The task force met, pursuant to notice, at 9:37 a.m., in room 210, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Brian J. Donnelly (chairman of the task force) presiding.

Mr. Donnelly. We meet today to focus on Government budget policies on women and children, especially in the entitlements programs such as AFDC, food stamps, medicaid, child nutrition, and social services. Our witnesses this morning have particular expertise on the subject of women and children both as participants in welfare programs and as scholars and administrators who have studied welfare programs. It is a fact that the poverty rate in this country has been increasing, wiping out many of the gains of the sixties and seventies, and so has the degree of poverty. In 1978, 61 percent of the poor had incomes below standard levels defined by the official poverty line. In 1982, 68 percent did. It is also a fact that women and children are a significant share of low-income persons, and the poverty rate for women has increased from 34.6 percent in 1981 to 36.3 percent in 1982.

In 1981 the poverty rate for children was 19.5 percent, and by 1982 it had risen to 21.3 percent.

The Children's Defense Fund reports that a truly alarming 47.3 percent of black children are below the threshold of poverty.

Of the 9 million American households headed by women, over one-third live in poverty. The average female head of a household with no spouse present in 1981 had an income of $10,960. The average male in a similar position earned $19,889.

For elderly women the situation is even more desperate. The median income for an elderly woman in 1982 was $5,365. Moreover, even women who worked full time earned significantly less than similarly employed men. Women who work full time earn only 59 percent of the earnings of a similarly employed male.

Certainly the administration has not created the economic plight of women and children. Lower earnings for women compared to men are historic. Children are a significant proportion of program recipients under food stamps, child nutrition, AFDC, and medicaid programs.

However, according to the CBO, the combined effect of tax and benefit changes made in the first year of the administration are a net decrease of $120 in income for households with incomes under $10,000.

Increases range from $300 to $15,000 for households with incomes over that amount. Since 1981, income security programs designed for women and children have sustained very large cuts. AFDC was cut by 13 percent. More than two-thirds of the AFDC recipients are children; 1.5 million children and their mothers have lost AFDC coverage and as a result lost their medicaid coverage.

Child nutrition programs have also been cut by 28 percent. Further, incentives to go to work have all but been eliminated. In 1981, the average AFDC family had $146 more in disposable income than the nonworking family. In 1983 that figure had been reduced to $9.

The great irony of this is that visiting these cuts on programs for the poor, on the means-tested entitlements, while leaving non-means-tested entitlements virtually untouched has had no effect on reducing the budget deficit.

The deficit continues to soar. Not only is this policy grossly unfair, it is wrongheaded. It does not work as advertised, and scapegoating women and children for our budgetary woes is bad social policy, bad politics, and bad economics.

These statistics make it obvious that any gender gap that might exist cannot possibly be the result of so-called perception problems. It is the result of real problems experienced by real people.

I am especially pleased to have here this morning as our first panel, four women to whom the shortcomings and failures of our welfare system are not "perception problems," but rather a matter of survival for themselves and their children. We are pleased to have with us this morning Ms. Suzanne Murphy of Boston, Mass.; Ms. Sadie Mobley of Washington, D.C.; Ms. Kathy Baker of Annapolis, Md.; and Ms. Anita Shepard of New York City, N.Y.

They are participants in the welfare system and have experienced firsthand the effects of administration policy, and I look forward to what I expect will be very enlightening testimony.

The focus of our inquiry today goes beyond simply examining the effects of current policy in cataloging the obvious failures of the current welfare system. It would be a mistake for those of us who are opposed to certain aspects of the administration policy to be pushed into defending the status quo, for it is clearly indefensible.

The questions are very simple: Has the current system weakened the family structure of beneficiaries? What is the purpose of our welfare system and what should the system be? Does the current system serve that purpose? Is there such a thing as long-term welfare dependency? How can we address that problem? How can the current system be restructured to be more effective?

These are complex questions and there are really no easy answers. I hope we can begin to address them this morning. It is vital that we seek out and implement constructive, innovative alternatives to the current system. I look forward to the testimony this morning of Dr. Eleanor Holmes Norton, a recognized expert in the academic research area; Barbara Blum, who has directed some very innovative and successful demonstration projects in this area; and Dr. Harriet McAdoo, an acknowledged expert in this field. I look forward to what I anticipate will be a most informative and interesting hearing.

Ms. Ferraro, do you have any opening remarks?

Ms. **Ferraro**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to commend you for your initiative in holding these hearings today and for your leadership in the areas of entitlements generally. These various welfare programs are critical to the well-being of millions of Americans and it is complicated because the distinctions between various types of programs are so misunderstood. The work of this task force has been instrumental in increasing understanding which is vital to sound policy making.

The 1980's have not been the best of times for women and children in America. The deepest recession in 50 years cost millions of poor working women, who tend to be at the margins of labor force, their jobs.

At the same time, the budget policies of the Reagan administration shredded the safety net of social programs that exist to protect the poorest and most vulnerable people in our society. There is no question that more and more women and children are the poorest and most vulnerable people in America and things are getting worse. One amazing statistic from my own State of New York illustrates the problem.

From 1970 to 1980, the total number of children in New York decreased by 1.2 million. While that overall decrease was occurring, the number of children living in poverty increased by 156,000. Most of those children live in female-headed families. According to the 1980 census, 53.6 percent of poor families are headed by women, but in New York that figure is 65.8 percent.

What makes these numbers even more depressing is that they reflect the situation as it was in 1980 so that they are not accurate as to the situation today. Thus, the impact of the Reagan budget cuts which were disproportionately targeted on women and the recent recession do not reflect themselves in those statistics.

The July 1983 census report demonstrates that things are even worse than they were in 1980. From 1981 to 1982, the poverty rate rose to 15 percent of all Americans, the highest rate since 1966. The 34.4 million Americans living in poverty in 1982 were 2.6 million more than just 1 year previous in 1981.

Again, children suffered most. The percentage of children living in poverty rose from 19.8 percent in 1981 to 21.7 percent in 1982. Of the 2.6 million increase in people living in poverty, 1.2 million—almost half—were children.

Female-headed households by far are most likely to be poor. The July census report found that while the poverty rate for married couple families in 1982 was 7.6 percent, it was almost five times that high for single-parent female-headed families.

The budget cuts made in 1981 and 1982 were devastating for many of those people. In program after program where the majority of beneficiaries were poor women and their children, sharp reductions were made and even sharper ones were proposed by the Reagan administration.

Food stamp funding was reduced by almost $3 billion in 1982 and 1983. More than two-thirds of the food stamp recipients are women and children, the overwhelming majority of them living below the poverty line.

Child nutrition spending, including school breakfast and school lunch, was reduced more than $2.3 billion in the first two Reagan budgets. Eighty percent of Federal school lunch and child care food program spending supports free and reduced price lunches for low-income children. The meals provided through the child care food program are vital to making day care services available for low income working women.

Medicaid spending was reduced by $2 billion. For 10 million poor children medicaid is virtually the only source of quality medical care.

The connection between AFDC and medicaid frequently forces women into difficult choices between work and welfare.

Funding for AFDC, the structure and effectiveness of which will be our focus today, was reduced by over $2 billion in 1981 and 1982.

Ninety-four percent of AFDC families are headed by single women and more than two-thirds of program recipients are children. Changes made in AFDC in 1982 worked especially to the disadvantage of poor working families.

I think we have two purposes in this hearing. One is to hear directly from women who benefit or have benefited from Federal assistance, how the programs are working and what effect the changes have had on what they have gotten. These are important questions because Congress needs firsthand information on the policy actions it has taken.

The administration has proposed further reduction in these programs, arguing that the changes which were made have not hurt people. In the face of mountains of evidence, the administration turns a callous eye and cold heart toward the damage they have done.

I was personally disappointed that neither Budget Director Stockman nor Health and Human Services Secretary Heckler was willing to attend this meeting to explain and defend the Reagan record. Perhaps they realize the record is indefensible. But beyond hearing testimony from real people who have dealt with the Federal assistance programs in these difficult times we also have to gain insight on how the programs might be made more effective and more useful to beneficiaries.

The growing number of single-parent female-headed families demands that we reexamine the approach we have taken and to redesign the programs to make economic independence more attainable.

I hope today we will increase our understanding of the problem so that we will be better able to devise solutions that work. I again want to commend you, Mr. Chairman, and I, too, look forward to the testimony of our witnesses.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Ms. Fiedler.

Ms. **Fiedler**. In listening to the comments made by my colleagues, I think it helps us to focus in on what a very major portion of our problem is—that the issues connected with trying to improve the quality of life for both women and children in our Nation has been so politicized that it distracts from the real problems we have.

I think that trying to approach the solutions by simply attacking this administration, or my attacking the Carter administration, or dwelling on the past 20 years of history is not going to change the future.

I think the important thing that we can contribute is the positive ideas, the experiences which you will bring to us today to share with us, and any recommended changes for the future.

I formerly represented a very large city, the city of Los Angeles of over 3½ million people. Among many of the citizens, there were large numbers of disadvantaged. One of the frustrations which I felt in trying to help those young people—because I happened to be a member of the school board, and often they are very young mothers—was the fact that simply giving money did not seem to help move larger numbers of them out of the poverty stream.

I have been working on a project for some period of time trying to see whether or not it is possible to help shrink the gap between welfare dependence and greater independence. It appears from statistics that I have looked at that the greatest level of success comes from those people who have been on welfare for a short period of time.

If any of you speaking before us can tell us what successes we might be able to achieve in terms of trying to help young women who are burdened by the rearing of young children, and bridge the gap between dependence and independence, I think it could be very enlightening in helping us find the keys to the future. Thank you for coming.

Mr. DONNELLY. Thank you.

At this time let us call our first panel and in this order, Ms. Suzanne Murphy from Boston; Ms. Sadie Mobley from Washington, D.C.; Kathy Baker from Annapolis, Md.; and Ms. Anita Shepard from New York.

STATEMENT OF SUZANNE MURPHY, BOSTON, MASS.

Ms. MURPHY. Good morning, Representative Donnelly, and members of the House Budget Committee. I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you today.

My name is Suzanne Murphy. I am a domestic engineer or homemaker, and a resident of Medford, Mass. I am also a single parent with four children and I am an AFDC recipient.

After being abandoned by my husband and with small children to raise, I found myself in a difficult situation over which I had no control. It was either go on welfare or see my children go hungry. I tried to survive on $50 a week for 3 months but finally I had to concede that there was no other choice for me to make so I entered the realm of the AFDC recipient. Receiving benefits for a family of four brings a monthly income of $444. With that amount of money, I must pay my rent, utilities, and other bills, buy food, and clothing, and pay any other expense that I acquire. Food stamps allow me $149 a month, but when divided by 4 weeks, the cost of my food allotment is $37 weekly. Not an exorbitant amount on which to feed a family of four.

I did not graduate from high school and so in 1980, when my children were older and my little one could be left in the care of a friend, I registered for the CETA program, went back to school and received my high school equivalency certificate. The next year promised to be exciting as I entered Bunker Hill Community College as a part-time student. I finished the year and enrolled for the following semester. However, my dreams for continuing my education were soon shattered as I found I could not afford the expenses of transportation for both myself and my children traveling back and forth to school each day. In addition, my friend could no longer care for my son and I could not afford a babysitter. I had to drop out.

For poor women educational opportunities are essential in order to prepare for living wage occupations. Education is a critical factor that may facilitate our escape from poverty to self-sufficiency. Yet, women earn less than men with comparable education at all levels of educational attainment.

When my son turned 6 last January, I enrolled in the work and training program now called ET or employment training. I am now a volunteer at Tri-CAP, an antipoverty agency in our area. I am unskilled and realize that I require training and experience in order to gain employment.

Women still earn 59 cents to a man's dollar and I recognize the fact that many fully employed women heading households are poor in spite of their work efforts. An AFDC mother who goes to work loses her medicaid after 3 months and her family is left without medical coverage. She also loses other benefits that are essential to her family's well-being. No family with children should have to go without medical services.

Other poor people are not able to obtain work because they lack education, training, experience, or important supportive services, such as child care and transportation. We need programs that provide us with incentives. We do not need programs that dehumanize us.

The welfare myth that AFDC recipients do not want to work is just that, a myth, not a reality. Welfare mothers and their children fall victims of the system.

In July 1981, Massachusetts welfare recipients did not receive their checks for a month during the State budget crisis. A group of AFDC mothers appealed to various food distribution centers and were able to provide 133 families—469 people—with free food.

After the overwhelming number of requests we received from people needing emergency food in our area, we decided to deal with the hunger situation head on. Thus, Mothers' Cupboard, a nonprofit emergency food distribution center, organized and run by welfare mothers to aid low-income people in our community was born. We now service 7 to 12 families a week with free food, triple the amount since we started in 1981.

Today, women, children, elderly, handicapped, deinstitutionalized, working poor, and unemployed now head the list of people who are homeless and hungry in America.

President Reagan has a task force to investigate if and why there is hunger in America. Yet he continues to cut millions of dollars from Federal food programs, one clear reason why hunger exists and is so widespread. And at the same, wasteful military expenditures increase.

We are one of the richest countries in the world, still the harsh reality is that in 1983 too many Americans are going without the basic necessities of food, shelter, and clothing. I find these existing conditions absolutely horrendous and heartbreaking. We realize that morally one does not have to do anything about a problem which one does not recognize but we can no longer permit psychological evasion of the truth and our own responsibility to those who are not able to provide for themselves.

It is time for us all to come together and lend a helping hand. It is time for our Government to shelter our homeless, feed our hungry, and clothe our naked, for living with dignity and respect is the God-given right of every individual.

I would just like to say that it is time for our society to wake up and recognize this truth. I am a professional. I am a mother and motherhood is the most honorable and revered profession this world has ever known. It is also a position that is deserving of the utmost respect.

Poor people are not making it in Massachusetts or across our Nation. I know, I see them every day and listen to their horror stories. Help our people, please, help our people. Thank you and good day.

Mr. DONNELLY. Thank you very much, Ms. Murphy. Ms. Mobley.

STATEMENT OF SADIE MOBLEY, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Ms. MOBLEY. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I am Sadie Mobley. I live in Northwest Washington, D.C. I am 53 years old.

I want to thank the committee for the opportunity to speak to you today on the problems I have faced over the past several years as a woman trying to raise her children.

In 1969, after 15 years of marriage, my husband left me alone to raise my two daughters ages 15 and 10 years old. I was a housewife and a mother and had only worked 1 day a week to make extra money for my family.

When my husband left me I didn't know what to do. All I knew was I had to find full-time work to pay my bills and feed my children. I looked for other work but there wasn't anything available. My only choice was to go to public assistance until I could find a steady job. It was hard to find a job because I only had a seventh grade education and very few job skills.

I talked to my worker who recommended getting into the WIN program. I thought this would be my chance to get a job skill. The WIN program found me a job cleaning the welfare office at night. It was a good job paying about $47 per week but there was no child care available. My daughter, age 10 years old, could not be left alone at night. My oldest daughter had to come over to watch my 10 year old until I was able to get a day job, which I found on my own. I began to work for a family cleaning their home 2 to 3 days a week while my daughter was in school. My earnings were $30 a day plus transportation. With my public assistance check of $41 a month, $62 in food stamps, $59 in energy assistance, medicaid and my earnings I was able to take care of my family. It was very hard to pay my rent and other bills but as long as I was working pretty regularly we were making it.

We hadn't heard from my husband for many years until he wanted a divorce. When our divorce was finalized, the court ordered my ex-husband to pay $80 per month child support directly to the welfare department. The child support was not always paid and, therefore, they told me my family could not receive any of the remainder of the child support money that was left. I started out receiving $189 per month but for the remainder of the last 2 years I only received $41 public assistance check and no child support.

Since 1978, I have worked an average of 2 days a week trying to make ends meet. It has been very hard to take care of my daughter, pay the bills, rent, buy clothes, and other needs, but with my earnings and the public assistance, I was able to do it. Then in May 1983, I lost my $41 check, my medicaid card, and the energy assistance. I was told by my worker that the reason I lost my public assistance was that I earned too much money and the welfare department could not subtract part of my earnings after 4 months of working.

I am an honest woman. I have always told my worker what I was doing. In fact, since January my daughter would help me fill out the monthly reporting form to make sure I filled in all the right information. Then they tell me I am making too much money and take my medicaid card. I am a diabetic and without my medicaid card I had to pay $30 a month for medicine and $30 for a visit to my doctor. Now I don't have enough money to pay my rent. It is really hard to understand. The welfare department got my $80 per month child support from May to October and all I got was an increase in food stamps of $106 but no public assistance check.

I am still working 2 to 3 days a week for the family cleaning their house, but I am worried about paying the $72 rent each month and all the other bills. My daughter needs things for school and I am not sure we can afford them. I want her to finish school and get a better education than I did. But it is hard, very hard.

Thanks to the Neighborhood Legal Service Office, I reapplied for medicaid and got my card back in October. I am still waiting to get the child support.

But what about all the money I had to spend on medicine and doctor bills? Will I be able to earn enough to pay our rent? I really don't know.

I want to thank you for having this hearing so I could share with you some of the problems I have experienced. I hope you can change some of the rules so people like me can work and also get some help. I just wanted you to know I am trying to work. I am doing the best that I can, but I am not receiving any help. Thank you.

Mr. DONNELLY. Thank you very much.

Let me explain at this point that we are going to have to recess for 10 minutes. When the bells go off behind you that means there is a rollcall, a vote requiring our presence in the House.

We will recess for 10 minutes and come back immediately and go on with your very fine testimony. The hearing is recessed.

[After recess.]

Mr. **Donnelly**. Our next witness is Anita Shepard from New York.

STATEMENT OF ANITA SHEPARD, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Ms. **Shepard**. Yes. I want to say good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

My name is Anita Shepard. I have a very serious problem. I am one of the homeless families. I am now living with my three children, ages 10, 8, and 6 in a hotel. We share one room with two double beds. I have applied for section 8, and with the New York City Housing Authority. My applications have been on file since 1980. I reapplied also in 1982. I am raising these three children alone. I am receiving in public assistance $148 every 2 weeks.

This is expected to stretch for clothing, carfare, telephone bill, laundry, school supplies, and personal needs. If I were in an apartment this would also have to cover utilities. I can't afford to send my children to the movies or even to the library to study because of the cost of carfare.

I receive a restaurant allowance of $58 a week which is supposed to cover three meals a day for 7 days a week. Sometimes I do not eat to stretch for another day so that my children will not go hungry. My food stamps used to be $200 a month and now it has been cut to $123 a month since May 1983. My last welfare grant was increased only $19 a month and that was in 1980.

I am very sincere about what I am saying. I have registered my three children in the school district where the motel is. I love this area. The children now have a chance to advance in their education. The school is excellent. They teach and prepare them for academic courses in the future. They are receiving education that some parents are paying for. My 6 year old who is in the first grade has a science class. What public school in Manhattan or the Bronx teaches first graders science? This school is P.S. 2 in Queens.

I am not one of the families that got evicted for not paying my rent or one of the families that set my home on fire. I am without housing because I was in a city building which was leased through a development corporation. Because they had no record of my apartment being rented to me, the rent went from $218 a month to $325 a month. Because the city was paying only $218 a month for rent, I would have had to take $107 out of my public assistance grant which would have left me with $151 a month to live on. I had no choice but to leave my apartment. Also at this time, my apartment was robbed, all my furniture, clothing, and the children's clothing and toys were stolen. I moved in with my aunt for 2 years.

We were two adults and three children in a three-room apartment. After 2 years in order not to have my aunt suffer hardship and to keep her rent stabilized, my children and I were forced to leave.

Last winter during the cold spell and the snowstorm, my children and I slept on trains and in abandoned buildings. Finally, I went to the welfare center and after insisting that they do something, I was placed in a motel. That was in January 1982. Since that time we have been in five different hotels or motels or shelters.

The State is now paying for my family of four $2,200 a month to stay in a hotel. If and when I locate an apartment, I will be allowed rent allowance of $218 a month.

I have two girls and a son. I need five rooms. The average rent in New York City is between $400 and $600 a month. If welfare would raise the rent budget there would be less families in emergency housing. We do not receive carfare when apartment hunting nor do we receive enough money for furniture. For a five-room apartment I will receive $180 per room. Landlords are discriminating against welfare clients not wanting to lease apartments over the budget that the family is allowed. Most times landlords will not even consider renting to a family on welfare.

I never have subjected my children to living like what they really are, three poor children. They do not know what it is really like to be hungry or without clothes. They may not eat what they would like to eat or wear the best of clothes, but they do know what it means to be clean and full. My children will not have Thanksgiving at home nor will they have what most kids call Christmas. I can't afford to buy winter clothes. I have been to many charities, churches, people. I have to beg for charity at least twice during the 2-week period between checks.

I am a young mother not like most. I don't want to stay down and sit waiting for a check. I want a job. I want a place to call home. I completed the 11th grade. I can't even get a chance to go back to school. I can't stay and live in this area. I can't even live like a human being. "I can't. I can't." That is all I hear. Why? Because I am poor. Everybody has to start somewhere, and the reason for me staying poor is because I will not be given a chance. Once I get settled I will get myself registered into a school and get a job. That is all I want, a chance to be something. I am not on welfare because I choose to be. I am not qualified enough to work in a job where I would receive enough salary to support three children plus myself. So now my children will have to suffer.

I am 27 years old and I have no life living like this. I have made some mistakes as everyone has. Do I have to pay for them for the rest of my life? Do my children have to pay for my mistakes?

As of this time, I have been given an extension to stay in the motel that I am at until the middle of November at which time I will be relocated again and all of our lives will be disrupted again. I don't even know if I will have a choice between another hotel or an apartment infested with rats and roaches. Where do I go from here? Our lives are in your hands. Thank you.

Mr. DONNELLY. Thank you very much. And now, Ms. Baker from Annapolis, Md.

STATEMENT OF KATHY BAKER, ANNAPOLIS, MD.

Ms. BAKER. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. My name is Kathy Baker. I am the mother of three boys, ages 10, 9, and 5, and I live in Annapolis, Md. I was raised in an upper middle class family in Annapolis, where I attended parochial school, the Anne Arundel Community College, and a local business school. I had a stable family life and I never imagined that I would ever be "poor." Even further from my mind was the thought that my children would ever be without a father, without money, without a home.

During my 9-year marriage, my husband got involved with drugs and alcohol and became emotionally and physically abusive toward me and the children. As our family life deteriorated, I was faced with the decision of whether to stay in a destructive situation or leave so we could be safe. My husband's attacks became more violent and it got to the point where I was afraid for our lives. So in January 1982, in the middle of a snowstorm, the children and I sneaked out of the home we were renting and went to stay temporarily with some friends. I had no money, no home, no job, and three small children. There were three adults and seven children in that one home. We were crowded and the boys and I slept on the floor but it was the only place we could go at that time.

I had been in counseling at the YWCA's Women's Center so I called there for assistance in finding an attorney. I was given the names of several women lawyers and I picked a women who turned out to be a dear friend as well as a caring attorney. She gave guidance and friendship and even hand-me-down clothes so I would have something to wear as I worked in her office in exchange for legal help. She told me to go to social services. About that time I was beginning to panic. I knew we could not live with friends forever, and my husband refused to support the children or even get a job. I desperately needed money, but welfare could not be the only answer for me.

As I realized that I was indeed a woman in poverty and my sons depended on me alone for everything, I began to do whatever was necessary to help us get out of this situation. I went to social services in a daze. It was a cold, impersonal place and the staff was unsmiling and untouched by a situation they had seen countless times before. I was devastated—but to them, it was just one more person asking for money. As endless questions were asked, I began to feel like my integrity was doubted—like I was lying just to get the money. I even began to feel guilty for asking for aid. I was ready to walk out because it was too humiliating to go on. But we were in real need and my children deserved these benefits so I kept on.

Within 3 days or so, I received $161 in food stamps. I would receive that each month. I was told that in about 1 month, I would receive the AFDC grant. That is a long time to wait when you have nothing to live on. Our AFDC check was $385 per month. While I was grateful, what hit me immediately was that this would never be enough for rent, utilities, and nonfood items. I was scared. I had not worked outside the home in the 9 years I had been a mother and a homemaker and I needed to settle my family in a home of our own. Our living situation had become impossible to continue. I was on the waiting list for public housing but I was told that would take about 2 years. Again, I was fortunate to have so many friends and family in the Annapolis area. None of them are wealthy, but I always had their support.

My parents fixed up their attic and the adjoining bedroom and we moved in with them and my sister and my brother in March 1982. Again, four adults and four children was crowded but necessary. I was immediately informed that my food stamps would be terminated, because I was living in my parents' home. My parents certainly could not afford to feed four extra people. I still needed the food stamps, and the only way I could continue receiving them was to set up separate cooking and food storage facilities in my bedroom. Those facilities were only an electric skillet and a hotplate.

I did not want to further burden my family so I began working part-time for my attorney. She started paying me instead of using our "barter" arrangement. When I told social services that I was working 3 days per week, I was told that I would lose all of the grant—but food stamps would continue at a decreased amount. Every time I took a step forward, I was pushed back a few steps. I did not see how I could ever get back on my feet, let alone ever get ahead of the game. A staff member at social services even suggested to me that I stay on welfare and forget about working as it would be easier. She said you have been doing fine since then, up until now. Why not just continue that way? But I did not want to stay on welfare forever—I just wanted some financial aid while I learned how to do my job so I could go on to earn more money and maybe even save a little money for emergencies. I did not want my children to grow up on welfare. Instead I wanted them to see me working to make myself a better person and to make a better life for them. It was discouraging and depressing being shoved back while I was struggling to go forward.

When I started working full time, medical assistance was also withdrawn and I had no health insurance for me and the children. Food stamps were dropped down to $25 per week. It was so frustrating. I paid some rent and utility payments to my parents, all miscellaneous items, doctor bills and medicine and a large portion of my paycheck went toward day care for my children. Yet, not one staff member at social services ever told me I could get free day care whenever I called to inform them of changes and pay increases with my job. I still could not afford rent for an apartment as I was told that with three children I would have to rent by law a three-bedroom unit, maybe even four bedrooms, and that would cost over $400 per month plus utilities. I was working full time yet going nowhere. A friend then told me about free day care. In December 1982 I was able to share a home with a divorced mother of two for $300 per month. It had then been almost 1 year since I had first gone to social services. The free day care is an excellent program and a very necessary one, yet it was never mentioned as a possible source of help to me. When I got it I was able to work while my children attended free day care—saving me about $365 a month. It is the only benefit that was not taken away as I tried to advance.

I was so tired of always being told that I made too much money. I was "too poor" to make it on my own, but yet "too rich" to receive financial assistance—just some solid advice and support would have been welcome even if money were not available to me. I did not want to take advantage of the welfare programs, I just wanted some temporary help.

I would like to also mention here that even grocery shopping became an ordeal. Clerks have embarrassed me countless times. I have been told to get a job. A ring that I was wearing, my great grandmother's ring, I cannot sell something that is not mine, it is mine to care for and I wore it proudly and I cannot tell you how many people commented on that alone. If I dress well I am judged harshly. If I dress in jeans and a T-shirt I am judged harshly. In other words, why is she on welfare if she is dressed so nicely, but when I had on jeans and a T-shirt, it was why does she dress so sloppily.

My ex-husband's salary was finally garnished in May 1983. I had petitioned the court for child support and domestic relations had to go through their paperwork and other procedures before we began receiving payments of $50 per week last May. A portion of his payments went to reimburse social services and the remainder went to the children. It was not enough to get us out of another unsuitable living situation, but just enough to wipe out my food stamps altogether. After only 5 months of receiving child support, it will now end since my ex-husband has left the State of Maryland. I will not be reapplying, however. I am fortunate enough to have met a man who wants to marry me and help me care and provide for my three children. But I often wonder—what if I had not met him? My situation was no different from what many women face. And it could happen to me again or to someone I care for. I worry about other women faced with these problems and setbacks who are not as fortunate as I have been. Only a very few women are so lucky, and I thank God I am one of the lucky ones.

Thank you.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Thank you all very much. Ms. Ferraro.

Ms. **Ferraro**. I would like to interrupt the proceedings a minute to introduce to you a group of students from my district. They are the debate team from Bryant High School. They are visiting Washington, they are going to find out how their Government works. They are going to watch some of the debate on the floor today, and I am delighted they will have a chance to listen to part of this hearing. It is an opportunity for them to learn what Government is doing for people who need help, and I hope they will take a report back to their classmates at school. I am delighted that you are here.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Welcome.

Thank you all for your testimony. I want you to feel as comfortable as you possibly can under the TV lights, I am sure it is very hot, and try not to be nervous and be as frank as you can in your answers.

After years of frustration in terms of dealing with the Government, this is your opportunity to let us know how you feel and what you think we ought to be doing to change a system that is clearly not working as it was intended to work.

I suppose my first question is a general one, and I would ask each of you to respond individually to it. If you were in our position, if you were a Member of Congress or if you were in an elected Government or appointed position that had control over the AFDC/food stamp program, what would you do to change it? What would you do to make it better? What would you do to make it more efficient in terms of taking care of people's needs and allowing them an opportunity for upward mobility so that your children will have an opportunity to have better lives than you have had an opportunity to have up to this point? Why do we not start with Ms. Baker.

Ms. **Baker**. I knew he was going to say that. First of all, listening to people like us who have been through it, keeping in touch with what is really going on instead of the myths that are going around about what people who are on welfare are like and how they are taking advantage of the system and do not want to work. If you keep in touch with people like us that is certainly a first step in the right direction.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Ms. Shepard.

Ms. **Shepard**. I will speak for myself. I do not really know how to answer that. I can say what I would like for you to do to help me.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Go ahead.

Ms. **Shepard**. I would like to get some trade skills where I can seek employment and make the wages where I could take care of my own family. Without the experience, I cannot get a job to take care of my family.

Ms. **Fiedler**. How much do you think that you need in order to live at some reasonable level of comfort so that you do not have to worry about how every single bill is going to be paid for?

Ms. **Shepard**. Well——

Ms. **Fiedler**. Not so much just welfare, but combined, whatever you earn.

Ms. **Shepard**. If we could get an allowance for clothing or an allowance for the different needs, like get a certain amount for food and a certain amount for clothing.

Ms. **Fiedler**. Do you think a combined amount of $600 or $700 a month?

Ms. **Shepard**. Without rent included?

Ms. **Fiedler**. With rent. For everything. How much is your rent?

Ms. **Shepard**. I am in a hotel now and the rent is $2,200 a month.

Ms. **Fiedler**. Normally it would be what, $300?

Ms. **Shepard**. Normally I am allowed $218, but if I was to get an apartment now the rent would be between $350 and $400 for four rooms.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Will the gentlelady yield? Rents in New York are exceptionally high.

Ms. **Fiedler**. They are high in Washington and Los Angeles. A lot of centers with the largest number of people needing assistance are in those urban areas. Obviously it has to be balanced based upon the community, but I am trying to get a sense of what you feel you need to keep yourself going, perhaps get a job, have enough money for transportation, telephone, gas bill, the basic necessities.

Ms. **Shepard**. About three times the amount that I am receiving now, which is $148.

Ms. **Fiedler**. So you need around $600?

Ms. **Shepard**. Right.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Ms. Mobley.

Ms. **Mobley**. I think that if I could keep my medicare and my days' work with a little help I could make it. That is why I think you all should help me for my doctor bills and things.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Ms. Murphy.

Ms. **Murphy**. I think women need incentives today. One of the biggest problems is when a woman goes to work, after 3 months she not only loses her medical coverage but her food stamps, so she is in the same position she was on welfare, and a lot of times she is better off on welfare. This is a major problem. We need educational opportunities. We need training, we need programs that have incentives. A family on food stamps is not making it. You cannot make it on $37 a week to feed a family. You cannot do it, I know, because I am involved in Mother's Cupboard, which is a food pantry. The food we do give to families just helps them to make it through the month because their food stamps just do not make it.

Mr. **Donnelly**. You have four children?

Ms. **Murphy**. Yes.

Mr. **Donnelly**. You receive $37 a week?

Ms. **Murphy**. It averages to $37 a week for groceries.

Mr. **Donnelly**. From the food stamp program?

Ms. **Murphy**. Yes.

Mr. **Donnelly**. How much do you receive a month from AFDC?

Ms. **Murphy**. $444.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Let me followup on the comment that you just made regarding the medicaid program. It seems to me that we are forcing people to make terrible choices, and the choice is that if you want to go out and try to work, to try to integrate yourself back into society, try to raise the level of your income, if you are able to get a job—how many years were you out of the work market?

Ms. **Murphy**. Nine years.

Mr. **Donnelly**. You were out 9 years?

Ms. **Murphy**. Yes.

Mr. **Donnelly**. What education did you have when you got married?

Ms. **Murphy**. I completed the ninth grade and that was it. I was married when I was 16.

Mr. **Donnelly**. You were married when you were 16 for 9 years, so it is very difficult to get a job, if you can get a job, because skills change so rapidly in this high-technology age. About 3 months after receiving that job you have to make a critical decision about continued medicaid coverage for your children. I do not think there is any question what a mother would do. There would not be any for me, as a father. My children would be covered for any medical emergency. That is, I think, one of the despicable things in the welfare system, that we are asking people to make these choices. While somebody tries to improve their lives and the lives of their children they are forced 3 or 4 months out into making a terrible decision about medical care coverage, and that is no decision at all.

Ms. **Shepard**. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Do you have any plans in the near future for changing the budgets?

Mr. **Donnelly**. Let me explain. We ask the questions and—that is the way it works.

Ms. **Fiedler**. Now just a moment. You told them this was their chance.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Let me say I hope so. We are going to try our best.

Ms. Murphy. I would just like to add one more thing. Child care is essential. If you want women to go out and work they have to know that their children are in capable hands.

Mr. Donnelly. How does the day care system work now?

Ms. Murphy. The day care system that we have goes on a voucher system. A day care is allowed to give so many poor women vouchers for placement. There are not enough day care centers in Massachusetts. If we do have day care centers they should be on a sliding fee scale for the mother.

Mr. Donnelly. How about the relationship that you have with your—whether it be social worker or employee at the department of welfare?

Ms. Murphy. I really do not have any problems with my social worker or the welfare department, because I know my rights and right now I am taking advocacy training courses with the Greater Boston Legal Services, my friends and I so that we can know our rights and reach out and help others.

Ms. Fiedler. Are you employed at this point?

Ms. Murphy. I am in an employment training program called ET.

Ms. Fiedler. Is that a State program?

Ms. Murphy. It is State, but it was operated from the Federal Government. When we had Governor King it was commonly known as workfare. I would just like to say that I do work as a volunteer at Tri-CAP, which is an antipoverty agency. I have a CSC slot where I receive $27.50 a week for traveling expenses.

Mr. Donnelly. Ms. Shepard, your story is heartrending. You have three children?

Ms. Shepard. Yes.

Mr. Donnelly. And you were one of the so-called homeless people. Was that this past winter?

Ms. Shepard. Yes; I am still a homeless family.

Mr. Donnelly. You are living in a motel?

Ms. Shepard. Yes.

Mr. Donnelly. How long were you out on the streets with your children?

Ms. Shepard. For a week.

Mr. Donnelly. Where did you live?

Ms. Shepard. We rode the trains and slept in abandoned buildings.

Mr. Donnelly. What month was that?

Ms. Shepard. December. That was because my sister said if I got an apartment they would just give me a month's rent. I wanted a place for myself and my kids. That is when they put me in a motel.

Mr. Donnelly. Have you applied for public housing in New York City?

Ms. Shepard. Yes.

Mr. Donnelly. How long did they say you would have to wait?

Ms. Shepard. I had an interview with section 8 last month and I am waiting but I had an application in since 1980 for section 8 and the New York City Housing Authority.

Mr. Donnelly. Ms. Baker, did you ever live in public housing or apply for it?

Ms. **Baker**. I applied for both public housing and section 8 existing. My name finally came up for the public housing, but at that time I was living in a basement of this divorced woman with her children upstairs and that was a nicer neighborhood so I took that.

Mr. **Donnelly**. How many years did you have to wait before you got notification of your acceptance?

Ms. **Baker**. About 1½ years.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Ms. Mobley, did you ever live in or apply for public housing?

Ms. **Mobley**. Yes; I did.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Did you get in?

Ms. **Mobley**. No.

Ms. **Murphy**. I live in public housing now in Medford and the waiting list for public housing, in our city, in Massachusetts, the waiting lists are anywhere from 10 to 50 years. Public housing is just not available. In our area the vacancy of apartments is less than 1 percent; 4 percent is considered emergency.

Ms. **Baker**. May I say something? You had asked about relationship with caseworkers, and we were talking about education. If anyone needs to be educated I think it is the people who are working with welfare recipients. They either do not know about the programs that are available to us or they do not know how to deal with people. For instance this day care program is tremendous. It is really terrific, and I certainly hope no cuts are taken there, because so many women—personally working for an attorney I am dealing with these kinds of women every day. We have numerous people who call and say I have to leave my home, where do I go? Having been through it I am in a position now where I can help someone else, but the people who are supposed to be doing this really are not doing it. I know they are not getting paid much themselves, but they simply are not providing the help that is there.

Ms. **Shepard**. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. I want to add to something that she just said. I think one of the laws of being on public assistance, once your children become school age you are eligible for a training program or employment. My son was 6 last week. I have not been called for a training program, and the worker said she did not know why.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Let me ask you two questions and then yield to my colleagues.

The first is about your ex-husbands. And I want to frame this as carefully as I can because I do not want to make public your very personal business. Have any of you received financial assistance from your ex-husbands voluntarily, first of all, and secondarily, if they had to be taken to court, how long did that process take, and if you have received money from your ex-husbands, do you think you are receiving a fair share of what his financial responsibility ought to be to yourselves and especially to your children?

Ms. **Baker**. My ex-husband never paid any money voluntarily. I have an informer on his side of the family. I have one sister-in-law who certainly tells me every now and then little bits that she hears. In his own words he said let her take care of the kids, she wants them, she can have them.

Mr. **Donnelly**. What sort of money does he make?

Ms. **Baker**. When he was working as a plumber he must have been making $15,000 or more, but I am not sure how often he worked with his problems. Since his salary was garnisheed he had no choice.

Mr. **Donnelly**. How many years did it take from the time you left until the court garnisheed his salary?

Ms. **Baker**. We left in January 1982 and it was May 1983 when I started receiving $50 a week.

Mr. **Donnelly**. How much a week?

Ms. **Baker**. $50 a week. He had agreed to pay $75, and even that is not really adequate.

Mr. **Donnelly**. So it took you basically 14 months to receive any sort of financial assistance for the children from your ex-husband?

Ms. **Baker**. I believe my caseworker at domestic relations said that each worker there has about a caseload of 500 people, and it is just impossible. By the time you get the bench warrant cut and go out and find him, it just goes on and on. She would tell him to come in for an interview and by phone he says I will be there. So he does not show up, so they give him the benefit of the doubt and set up another interview——

Mr. **Donnelly**. And the chase is on.

Ms. **Murphy**. I have never received child support from my ex-husband. However, I have given the welfare department his social security number I could not tell you how many times and said here is his social security number, track him down, and they have never responded.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Do you have any idea of his income?

Ms. **Murphy**. I have no idea.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Do you think he is working?

Ms. **Murphy**. I do not know, because we have not seen hide nor hair of him since he walked out.

Ms. **Shepard**. I have been signing papers for years to try to get child support and the court will not do it. I just signed papers last week.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Do you know if your ex-husband is working?

Ms. **Shepard**. I do not know. But they have not made any effort to try and find out, either.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Let me ask one final question. I know Ms. Fiedler wants to get to questioning. It is about your children. The whole thrust of the AFDC program in my opinion, correctly or incorrectly, but it is an opinion that I hold strongly, is that we have this program so that the children will not be punished for the mistakes of the parents, and to me the whole conception of having a program like this would bring out what I would hope to be the best of America, that if my wife and I maybe had problems that our children would not suffer because of that, that society would come in to help those children so that they would be able to go out in the world and compete on an equal footing. The reality is that it is not happening.

What do you think because of the situations that you are in and because of this whole AFDC and welfare quagmire, what do you think the effect has been on your children? Is the program doing what I think we all want it to do, to help those kids, to see that those children are not punished, or have your children been punished?

Ms. MURPHY. When children are on AFDC they are punished because they are stigmatized. I live in public housing. My children go to school and there are often times that they have playmates that live outside of the development and their mothers will not let them come down to play in the development, so it is stigmatizing.

Mr. DONNELLY. We used to call them projects.

Ms. MURPHY. That has negative overtones. I think "development" should be the word. Children are hurting, really hurting. When you ask your child to go to the store for you when you give them food stamps, they are so embarrassed, and understandably so. So children are hurting.

Ms. SHEPARD. My children are hurting because all they receive now is cold sandwiches. They receive gas in their stomachs. The only time they receive a good meal is if I travel to my family's house. They are closed into one room. There is no playground. To go anywhere you have to pay carfare, and for one fare in New York City it is 75 cents. Mine are really suffering.

Mr. DONNELLY. Would any of you want to see any of your daughters on welfare 20 years from now?

Ms. SHEPARD. Not 1 year from now.

Ms. MURPHY. I would never want to see any of my children on welfare, and so I am telling them to get their education and to be their own person and their own individual so they can stand on their own two feet and never have to rely on anyone.

Mr. DONNELLY. Ms. Fiedler.

Ms. FIEDLER. You know the testimony that you have given here has been extremely valuable, because what you have really said in each of your stories is that the system which has been devised over a period of 40 years has not worked effectively enough to be able to give you the assistance to move yourself from the AFDC program, or any special Government program which has been devised, to help you build stronger and better lives. You are all young women. Your future is ahead of you, and yet to some degree you have described a rather hopeless situation.

I happen to agree with the comment that you made before, Ms. Baker, that being a mother is the most important thing to be. In my own life, that is the most important thing that I have ever done, and to face the frustration and the difficulty that you have faced in spite of the many billions of dollars which we have poured into public assistance programs is really a tragedy, because we do have enough money. We are spending enough money to do the job. It is my understanding that for every welfare family there is about $40,000 spent in total for all the administration, and all of the special benefits, but unfortunately you become eligible for only a fraction of the amount that is actually spent within this whole bureaucracy. It seems to me that we really need to look at the program, hopefully on a bipartisan basis, because I do not think this happened overnight and I do not think it is a result of a 1-percent cut here or a 2-percent addition there. We really need to look at this program and try to make some decisions which will help you to build better lives rather than keeping you indefinitely leaning upon this system when in fact you all have shown immense energy and a tremendous amount of strength.

I have to tell you I am awful proud of you and proud of those women that you represent, because it is not easy raising a family on your own, being responsible for all the problems, and also keeping yourself psychologically propped up enough to keep putting one foot in front of the other. Yet the responsibility that you have been shouldering alone has been demanding that of you.

I am convinced that we need to make certain that medicaid is extended beyond the welfare AFDC period. I am not certain how much for how long. The reason I asked the question before was to try to find out how much money you honestly feel that you need. I am convinced personally that under about $10,000 in income, particularly for a family situation where you have a mother and a child or several children, you just cannot make it on your own. I do not think there is a person in this room who is working who thinks they can live on less than $1,000 a month. I have raised two children alone and I do not think it is possible to live with any decent degree of self-confidence in the future without that. So that is one thing that I would hope that we would consider recommending.

Another thing that I have heard a lot about is the need for transportation. I think it is an ignored area. In order for you to go to a job or even to move outside of your area, you said it costs 75 cents per ride and that means for you and your family. It is a sizable portion of the amount of money that you have. You cannot look for a job, you cannot heighten your spirit so to speak without some assistance in that area, but it also seems to me being familiar with a public transportation system in a major city, that that is something that perhaps the local systems might be able to do. Perhaps they could work out some kind of a voucher system with many of the underutilized transit systems. You see these across the Nation that have existing space and there is no reason why particularly for job-related transportation, there could not be some kind of an arrangement worked out. We invest a huge amount of money in subsidizing public transportation systems nationally, and if you were given an opportunity to be able to use a bus system and not add on to your costs—we are talking about $50 to $60 a month cash outlay out of your pocket to get to work—then that would also give you some assistance.

I wonder if you might comment on both of those things, because as we try to analyze from really the other side of the table what you need in terms of assistance, your input I think is extremely valuable to us. It will perhaps help to direct us as to whether or not we are really on target and what we are thinking about. Those are two areas I am thinking about and I think from what I heard from my colleague the medicaid issue is something that he feels strongly about concerning a longer period on medicaid.

Ms. SHEPARD. There is not too much that I can say on that. The only thing I want now is a home and a job and to get in the training program. I am homeless. The only thing I can see right now for the near future is a home.

Ms. MOBLEY. There is nothing I can say on that. I am working 3 days, but I need other help like medicare to pay my doctor bill. I do not receive anything now. I am just only working 3 days—I am living on 3 days.

Ms. **Fiedler**. What do you pay in transportation?

Ms. **Mobley**. I pay $1.25—I work in Maryland—$1.25 going, $1.10 coming back. That would be $2.30 going and coming.

Mr. **Donnelly**. How much money—you work 3 days a week?

Ms. **Mobley**. Yes.

Mr. **Donnelly**. How much money do you make a week?

Ms. **Mobley**. I make $90 for 3 days.

Mr. **Donnelly**. $30 a day?

Ms. **Mobley**. Yes.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Because of that you lost your medicaid coverage?

Ms. **Mobley**. Right.

Mr. **Donnelly**. It is not worthwhile working, is it?

Ms. **Mobley**. Well, I was trying to not depend on the welfare. I wanted to be on my own, but I just cannot make it.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Good for you. Ms. Fiedler, would you yield?

Ms. **Fiedler**. Sure.

Mr. **Donnelly**. I want to ask you a question about food stamps. The whole idea of the food stamp program is to make sure that people will buy food with it, which I think is somewhat presumptive because you are basically saying you don't trust the mothers of America; they are going to take the money and spend it on something else and not feed their children.

I don't buy that premise that mothers will take it and not feed their children. I will have to be honest with you. I think there is a stigma attached to the food stamp system. About 2 weeks ago, I went into Cumberland Farms and the woman in front of me put down food stamps, and I took a second look. It is just a natural inclination to do that. Had she put down $3 in cash, I would have just continued reading my paper and buying my cigarettes. But she put down the food stamps, and I looked at her and looked at what she was buying. She was buying milk and bread and things like that. Would you rather receive the cash sum payment and be trusted to spend that on food?

Ms. **Baker**. I would much rather receive the cash, because there are instances where there are things—for instance, vitamins. While I could buy potato chips and nobody would blink an eye, when I go in to buy vitamins—the one time this happened was about the first time I used my food stamps. The woman made quite a big fuss over vitamins not being eligible food stamp items, and I was thoroughly embarrassed and a bit disgusted at her explanation of what I could and couldn't buy.

I also had an instance where I was buying some kind of fried chicken, something that was prepared, and I needed something quick because I had been working and it was one of those instances where I got something that was cooked, and the woman looked at me and said, "You cannot buy cooked food with food stamps." And there were several people behind me and they were all vitally interested in this.

Not to be a smart aleck, I said, "Well, the bread is cooked, and you rung that up." She said, "Come now. Do you use your food stamps in a restaurant? No, I am sure you don't." She was really uppity about it. And I wrote a letter to that store and got a letter of apology in return. I suggested to the manager that he properly educate his staff.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Good for you.

Ms. **Murphy**. I think cash would be good, also. There are a lot of things, like Ms. Baker said, that you can't buy with food stamps. You need soap powder, toilet paper. There are just basic necessities that you do need, and food stamps just will not purchase them.

Mr. **Donnelly**. What about the debilitating effect of walking in with the little stamp?

Ms. **Murphy**. It is painful and it hurts.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Are you concerned about the impact it makes when you send your child to the store to buy a loaf of bread?

Ms. **Murphy**. Not only the children get dirty looks, but the mothers get dirty looks. When you are standing there and you have done your grocery shopping, because you know this has to last you for 2 weeks, and everybody is making comments, "Look at all that food, and she is on food stamps," this is ridiculous. And you are getting dirty looks from the cashiers. At times, I have even gotten snide remarks.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Ms. Fiedler.

Ms. **Fiedler**. I don't really have any more questions. I want to thank you for taking the time to come. I hope that other committees that are involved in making decisions will invite either you or others like you to help them make better decisions.

One of the things I have found back here—maybe this is just one Member's perspective—is that the decisionmaking here isn't very good. It is very well motivated. People care a whole lot; they really do. I don't care whether they are Reagan Republicans or Carter Democrats, they do care and would like to be able to invest the public's money in a way that will do the most good.

Unfortunately, there tends to be a narrow scope of experience on the part of the Members, and they are not equipped to understand the problems of a welfare mother or some of the aged problems that we see or the disabled. So being able to hear from you firsthand is extremely valuable. I hope it will broaden our perspective to help us make better decisions in the future.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Ms. Ferraro.

Ms. **Ferraro**. I would like to share some statistics with reference to public housing with reference to what Ms. Shepard testified. In 1981, there were 1,537 new section 8 units in New York. In 1982, it was curtailed to only 750, and those were solely 202, and they went to the elderly and the handicapped. In 1983, it was reduced again to 618 new units; 1984, down to 440 due to budget cuts. We have currently in New York 165,000 people on housing waiting lists, and there is no money for New York City to do this on its own.

With reference to transit, our system is not underutilized. We have over 2 million riders a day on the system. The subway now costs 75 cents for each ride, going up to $1 in the next few weeks. We have reduced assistance from the Federal Government in operating subsidies and capital improvements are next to nothing for our system, because it is not a system like the system in Los Angles. We have real problems in New York City, and it is because of cuts in Federal programs that we are giving assistance.

But in addition to that, it is loss of revenues to New York City because of the tax cut enacted last year. New York's revenues are piggybacked on the Federal assistance. So we can't dump the budget cuts from the Federal Government on to the municipalities.

Let me go into the budget cuts. I was intrigued when my colleague said that with a family we should have at least $1,000 a month to live on. You need that much. I know I have three children, as well, and they get hungry and as they get older they get hungrier.

Ms. Mobley, could you chat with me about what you were getting, say, in 1979, which was 10 years after your husband left?

Ms. **Mobley**. I was getting $189.

Ms. **Ferraro**. From AFDC?

Ms. **Mobley**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. How much were you getting from food stamps?

Ms. **Mobley**. $62.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Were you getting energy assistance?

Ms. **Mobley**. No.

Ms. **Ferraro**. In 1979, you were getting $189, and $62 in food stamps. In 1980 or 1981, were you getting those same amounts?

Ms. **Mobley**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Were you getting any other assistance?

Ms. **Mobley**. In 1980, I started getting $59 in energy assistance.

Ms. **Ferraro**. So you were getting a total of $310 in 1980 as assistance between welfare, food stamps, and energy assistance. Were you working at that time?

Ms. **Mobley**. Yes; 1 day.

Ms. **Ferraro**. One day a week?

Ms. **Mobley**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. How much were you earning?

Ms. **Mobley**. I was earning $27 a day.

Ms. **Ferraro**. In 1981, which would be after the budget cuts that we are discussing today, what were you getting in AFDC?

Ms. **Mobley**. In 1981?

Ms. **Ferraro**. Yes.

Ms. **Mobley**. I was getting $189.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Go to 1982, after the October 1981 cuts. What were you getting for AFDC?

Ms. **Mobley**. That is when I started getting the $41.

Ms. **Ferraro**. So you were reduced from $189 to $41?

Ms. **Mobley**. Yes.

Ms. **Fiedler**. You began to work 3 days a week, though, at that point?

Ms. **Mobley**. That is lately.

Ms. **Ferraro**. So you went to $41 from $189?

Ms. **Mobley**. Right.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Were you getting food stamps?

Ms. **Mobley**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. What was that?

Ms. **Mobley**. $62.

Ms. **Ferraro**. In 1982 and 1983, was that the same amount?

Ms. **Mobley**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. You didn't get increased?

Ms. Mobley. I got a $69 increase about 6 months; then they cut me back.

Ms. Ferraro. So you are at $62?

Ms. Mobley. Right.

Ms. Ferraro. And energy assistance?

Ms. Mobley. I wasn't receiving that until 1980.

Ms. Ferraro. I am talking about recently.

Ms. Mobley. $59.

Ms. Ferraro. So you were getting $41, $62, $59, which is $163 a month Federal assistance; am I right?

Ms. Mobley. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Ferraro. So you were reduced from $310 to $163. Were you working in 1980?

Ms. Mobley. Yes.

Ms. Ferraro. How often were you working?

Ms. Mobley. One day a week.

Ms. Ferraro. How much were you earning?

Ms. Mobley. $27 a day.

Ms. Ferraro. Ms. Mobley, why were you only working 1 day a week?

Ms. Mobley. I couldn't get any more.

Ms. Ferraro. You couldn't get any more work?

Ms. Mobley. No.

Ms. Ferraro. Would you have worked more had you had the opportunity?

Ms. Mobley. Yes, I would have.

Ms. Ferraro. So you were making $27 a week at the time you were working 1 day, and $310 in Federal assistance?

Ms. Mobley. Right.

Ms. Ferraro. Now are you working?

Ms. Mobley. Yes, I am.

Ms. Ferraro. How often?

Ms. Mobley. Three days a week.

Ms. Ferraro. Are you still making $27 a day?

Ms. Mobley. No. I make $30 a day.

Ms. Ferraro. $30 a day?

Ms. Mobley. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Ferraro. $30 a day. So you are making $90 a week. So working 3 days a week——

Ms. Mobley. Yes.

Ms. Ferraro [continuing]. You are actually making less money now working 3 days a week than you were getting before working 1 day a week and getting the assistance from the Federal Government; is that not right?

Ms. Mobley. No, ma'am, that is not right. I am getting more now.

Ms. Ferraro. OK, you are working 3 days a week. You are making $90 a week times 4—you are making $360 a month. Add that on to your $163 that you are getting and you are getting $523 a month to live right now for you and your daughter; right?

Ms. Mobley. Now, no, ma'am. I am not getting that now.

Ms. Ferraro. Could you help us here?

Ms. Lynch. She is no longer getting any AFDC benefit. She was cut off completely in May, and she lost her AFDC and medical assistance.

Mr. Donnelly. She has medical assistance back?

Ms. Lynch. She got the medical assistance back this month.

Ms. Ferraro. $360 a month, because you are working 3 days a week.

Ms. Mobley. Yes.

Ms. Ferraro. Plus $62 for food stamps; plus $59 for energy assistance.

Ms. Mobley. I wasn't getting that at that time.

Ms. Ferraro. Let's talk about today.

Mr. Donnelly. Are you receiving energy assistance now?

Ms. Mobley. I don't receive anything today, no public assistance.

Ms. Ferraro. You are not receiving food stamps, either?

Ms. Mobley. I receive food stamps—$106 since May.

Ms. Ferraro. So that is $106 plus $90 a week, which is $360 a month, or $466; correct?

Ms. Lynch. The complication here is that she works 2 days some weeks, 3 days some weeks.

Ms. Ferraro. Use it as a maximum. I am trying to get to the maximum of what she is getting today working a maximum of 3 days a week with the budget cuts in place, so we can determine exactly what she is living on.

The maximum that she is living on is $466 a month; am I right?

Ms. Lynch. $360 in cash plus $106 in food stamps; that is it.

Ms. Ferraro. $466 a month, which is what I said. All right.

In 1979, working 1 day a week and getting public assistance, she was making $418 a month plus getting medicaid, which took care of all of her medical expenses?

Ms. Mobley. Right.

Ms. Ferraro. My next question is, why are you working when you are better off staying home and working the 1 day a week?

Ms. Mobley. Like I said, they told me to go to work. The public assistance told me to go to work and find me a job. And so that is what I was out to do, to find a job.

Ms. Ferraro. You got the job 3 days a week?

Ms. Mobley. Yes. I was up on the WIN program, and that is how I started to work.

Ms. Ferraro. I guess the point that I am trying to make is that you were better off. So you are trying to work now. If you really wanted to take advantage of the Government programs, you might be better off just staying home and letting somebody else take care of you.

Ms. Mobley. Yes.

Ms. Fiedler. Would the gentlelady yield?

Ms. Ferraro. Yes.

Ms. Fiedler. One of the things that I keep hearing here and which bothers me is that I think there is more than one reason why you are working. There are three of you that had talked about working. It seems to me that there is a reason why you are working that doesn't just directly relate to how much money you are getting. Are there other reasons why you are working? Are there other benefits to your working?

Ms. **Murphy**. I would like to say that it took me many years. I had lost my self-confidence and I got my self-confidence back. And I think women living in poverty have very little self-esteem, but once they get the supportive services of what they need and they get their confidence back, they do want to go to work. Nobody likes living on welfare. Nobody wants to hand food stamps at a store when they could use cash. We want to work. We want the opportunity so that we can earn enough money to support our families.

Ms. **Fiedler**. So the self-esteem which you describe is another very important part?

Ms. **Murphy**. Of course it is. When you are browbeaten and you are kept down in the system for so many years, it takes a lot of guts and a lot of courage to pull yourself up and do what you have to do, not only for yourself but for your children.

Ms. **Fiedler**. I thought it was an important point to bring out, because that is a pride. Where even if it meant a slight difference, you might choose work because of how you felt about yourself.

I have heard the statement often that people are told, "Don't go to work because you will lose some benefits." It is unfortunate that this system is devised in such a way as to not only discourage you from working as a result of the economic losses that you face, but fails to recognize the very special sense of self-worth that you have by being able to take care of yourself or even contribute through 1 day of work a week or 2 days of work a week to your family and to your own welfare.

Ms. **Ferraro**. I would like to add, however—and I am sure my colleague, as a mother of children, who goes to the grocery store—and I do the shopping in my house—that self-esteem doesn't buy you food to put on your table.

Ms. **Fiedler**. That is what we are talking about.

Ms. **Ferraro**. It is a combination of, yes, you want self-esteem—nobody wants to live on food stamps alone, or no one wants to take welfare. But these women are saying something more than that. There are no Government programs for training that will help them. If they go to work, they are being punished by having their benefits reduced, and that is the problem. That is the disincentive—when you reduce the amount of money so you can't buy food for your kids.

Ms. Murphy, your children are now grown, are they not?

Ms. **Murphy**. I have two that are grown.

Ms. **Ferraro**. They are in college?

Ms. **Murphy**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Those two children, are they eligible for food stamps?

Ms. **Murphy**. When your child reaches 18 and they are not in high school, then automatically they are cut off of AFDC. However, if you have a child that is a student, they are eligible to submit their own application and apply for food stamps.

Ms. **Ferraro**. That is if they do not live at home?

Ms. **Murphy**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Are your children at home?

Ms. **Murphy**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Are you getting food stamps for your 18-year-old at home?

Ms. **Murphy**. No, I am not.

Ms. **Ferraro**. So you are feeding, for $37 a week, two adults and two younger children?

Ms. **Murphy**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Again, that was the budget cut that was not in existence with removing of students from the food stamp program once they were in college. It was done in order to correct what was apparently a lot of wealthy kids asking for food stamps. But there are a lot of kids who need those food stamps and whose families need the food stamps who are not eligible because of budget cuts.

Ms. **Shepard**. I want to speak on the car bit. It costs me $3 just to go to my center to pick my check up and get back to the motel.

Mr. **Donnelly**. The State is paying $2,200 a month to have you in a motel?

Ms. **Shepard**. Yes; one room with two double beds, no refrigeration, no cooking facilities.

Mr. **Donnelly**. You only have one room for $2,200?

Ms. **Shepard**. Yes. I have to pay for my own phone bill. That comes out of my check, also.

Mr. **Donnelly**. What are the sexes of your children?

Ms. **Shepard**. Two females and one male.

Mr. **Donnelly**. All living in one room?

Ms. **Shepard**. Yes. And my son is 6.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Ms. Baker, I want to go back to your testimony. You indicated after you left your husband in January you were living on $50 a week. Where did you get that money from?

Ms. **Murphy**. That was my testimony.

Ms. **Ferraro**. I am sorry.

Ms. **Murphy**. That $50 a week my dad sent me. And he could no longer afford to send it to me, and that was when I went down to the welfare office.

Ms. **Ferraro**. So that your family did try to assist you?

Ms. **Murphy**. They did try to assist me but they couldn't afford it.

Ms. **Ferraro**. What took you 3 months to go down to the welfare office?

Ms. **Murphy**. My pride.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Ms. Baker, when you left your husband, how much were you getting in food stamps or how much were you able to get once you established eligibility?

Ms. **Baker**. After a brief waiting period, I began to receive $161 a month.

Ms. **Ferraro**. After you waited your time, how much did you get for AFDC?

Ms. **Baker**. $385.

Ms. **Ferraro**. For a total of $546 a month?

Ms. **Baker**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. You started working February 1982?

Ms. **Baker**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. How much did you get paid at that time?

Ms. **Baker**. Nothing.

Ms. **Ferraro**. When, if ever, did you start getting paid a salary?

Ms. **Baker**. It is hard to remember. Probably in May. Possibly—no. I am sorry. It was in the summer.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Summer 1982?

Ms. **Baker**. Yes. I started working 3 days a week.

Ms. **Ferraro**. How much did you earn?

Ms. **Baker**. About $110 a week.

Ms. **Ferraro**. So you were earning $110 a week. What were you getting on AFDC when you earned $110 a week?

Ms. **Baker**. I lost the grant at that time.

Ms. **Ferraro**. So you were earning $440 a week—a month?

Ms. **Baker**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. You lost your AFDC for $385 a month?

Ms. **Baker**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. So you ended up with $55 a month almost net profit. Did your food stamps remain the same as you continued working?

Ms. **Baker**. No. They were decreased to about $130 or $140 at that time.

Ms. **Ferraro**. So they were decreased by $20 or $25 a week?

Ms. **Baker**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. So that going to work 3 days a week earning $110 a week you ended up getting a total of $140 in food stamps so the big profit you made working, and with Federal assistance, was a big total of $35 a month; right?

Ms. **Baker**. That sounds about right, plus I have day care. If I couldn't get someone to watch my children free, I had to pay that, too.

Ms. **Ferraro**. So that it wasn't a big profit, you did not end up making.

Ms. **Baker**. I didn't make any money, no.

Ms. **Ferraro**. How much did it cost for day care?

Ms. **Baker**. Day care part time was about $60 a week.

Ms. **Ferraro**. The sum of $60 a week for day care?

Ms. **Baker**. Yes. That is when I worked part time.

Ms. **Ferraro**. That is when you were making $110 a week?

Ms. **Baker**. $110 a week. But we had food. That was when I was living with my parents. So I—if I had any left over, if there ever was anything, I would say put this toward the gas and electric bill, but that didn't happen very often after awhile.

Ms. **Ferraro**. So that actually when you were working part time, you made $110 a week, it was costing you $60 a week day care and you ended up losing the AFDC and you ended up with a reduction in food stamps?

Ms. **Baker**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Are you working now?

Ms. **Baker**. Yes.

Ms. **Ferraro**. What are you earning?

Ms. **Baker**. $200 a week.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Are you getting assistance?

Ms. **Baker**. No.

Ms. **Ferraro**. No AFDC?

Ms. **Baker**. No.

Ms. **Ferraro**. No food stamps?

Ms. **Baker**. No. Just the day care.

Ms. **Ferraro**. What are you getting with day care?

Ms. **Baker**. I just have—I have three vouchers, one for each child. At this point I don't pay anything for day care.

Ms. **Ferraro**. All right. I think again what I am trying to point out with each of you, is that not only do you have the desire to work and the pride and self-esteem that goes with that, I know we want to do it ourselves, but sometimes you have to balance off your pride with what you are actually going to be able to give your kids. The tradeoff is you want to feed your kids. You want health care for your kids.

I think that is what we have to understand. If the system doesn't work, we have to do something about it. But the reason the system doesn't work is because we have gone in and changed the eligibility requirements and when women work they then become noneligible for the assistance and we seem to be working one against the other and I think they are very, very foolish.

Ms. **Baker**. May I say something in addition to what you said? I think it is a shame that you feel so stupid asking for this help when you come right down to it. It is a sign of intelligence when you realize your limitations and you reach out to someone for help and you say, I need such and such to get back on my feet.

I think the aid ought to be there for those people who are willing to use what they can and get themselves started up and get a decent home for their children and then go on from there and say that I don't need the assistance anymore.

Ms. **Ferraro**. I don't think that is stupid at all, Ms. Baker. What you are dealing with is cost effectiveness and it is cost effectiveness in a lot of ways. If you help people and train them when they are capable of being trained, you put them into the work force so they can not only take care of themselves, but they are contributing taxes to the Government so we can all be part of the whole system.

I think it is cost effective. The idea is selling people in this Congress on the cost effectiveness of programs such as food stamps, AFDC, WIN, job training.

You know, those are all very, very important programs. We have a little problem selling them in the Congress here, but it is not stupid, it is about as far from stupid as it could possibly get. I appreciate each of your testimonies here today and certainly want to thank you for appearing before our committee.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Let me join with both Ms. Ferraro and Ms. Fiedler. Your appearance has gone a long way, hopefully, to dispel the myth that welfare mothers drive around in Cadillacs, have little pinky rings with diamonds on them, and sit around watching TV and eating caviar in the afternoon.

But the sad fact of the matter is that that is a prevalent myth in this country when people think of welfare. They immediately think of waste, fraud and abuse.

The suffering and damage that it is doing to hundreds of millions of children in this country is immense. The system, frankly, stinks. A classic example of what is wrong with the system is shown by Ms. Ferraro's line of questioning—you would have to be a graduate of MIT to figure out exactly what your benefits are to balance your weekly checkbook so that at the end of the week your children have something to eat so that you don't have to go out on the street and beg alms and beg for food.

It is an absolute unmitigated outrage that we treat women and children in this country with this terrible system. Let me make another point, this is not just a woman's issue. This is a men's issue, too, because men are certainly involved in part of the process and part of the problem, there is a great responsibliity on the males in this society to pick up the charge and articulate and verbalize the problem and it is just not a woman's issue.

There are a lot of young men involved who are living in homes where they can barely receive a decent meal every day. You can't tell me, with all of the wealth in this country and the decency of the American people, that if they understood the circumstances under which we force millions of Americans, women and children, to live, they would not be outraged.

I hope we begin a process to dispel the myth that you people are sitting fat and happy. There is a tremendous amount of damage being done to you and to your children and sometimes psychological damage is irreversible.

To have your children go to college, Ms. Murphy, and to see them as they go through life have a better opportunity in this society than you had is worth every dollar that we invest and we invested very few dollars in the four of you and you have done and you are doing a magnificent job.

Thank you all very much. I hope you will stay and listen to the rest of the testimony, and thank you all again.

Ms. **BAKER**. Thank you.

Ms. **SHEPARD**. Thank you.

Ms. **MURPHY**. Thank you.

Mr. **DONNELLY**. We are running a little late. Senator Moynihan was supposed to testify this morning. However, he was tied up in New York State and could not be with us.

We are privileged and honored to have Prof. Eleanor Holmes Norton from Georgetown University Law Center. Professor Norton.

STATEMENT OF ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, PROFESSOR, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Ms. **NORTON**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **DONNELLY**. I am sorry to have kept you waiting but I think the testimony of these four women this morning was well worth the time.

Ms. **NORTON**. I think the committee needs that testimony from the field.

Mr. **DONNELLY**. I think the entire Congress does.

Ms. **NORTON**. Mr. Chairman, Congresswoman Ferraro, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today on behalf of the Joint Center for Political Studies and the Tarrytown Group of black scholars. The document produced by the Tarrytown Group, brought together by the Joint Center in 1981 and 1982, represents an attempt to rethink some of the major problems confronting the black community today.

The statement, entitled "The Black Family," is the first statement of its kind on this delicate and important subject produced by a group of black thinkers. For this reason, it has been given special weight in discussions of the black family that are only now beginning among concerned Americans.

In summary, the Tarrytown Group concluded that the most striking measure of the cumulative effect of American racism today is the precipitous reduction in the strength of the black family. Its repair is central to any serious strategy to improve the black condition.

No group brought a stronger family tradition to America than blacks, whose family life incorporated the patterns of African societies that were organized around kinship and family itself.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, extended families are much more prevalent in the black community today than in the white community today.

Not until the 1960's did black family life—after generations of corrosive governmental and societal policies—meet ultimately destabilizing forces: migration that was often virtually compulsory, rapid urbanization and ghettoization, and structural unemployment.

This was when plantations were mechanized in the South and people were simply put off the plantations and out of sharecropping.

As a result, almost half of all black families are now headed by women. Most seriously, more than half of all black children are raised by single mothers, many of whom are teenagers themselves and most of whom are poor.

Some of the most vexing problems of the black community, especially hardcore poverty and its consequences, can be traced to family structures that have been weakened by racism and its continuing effects.

Three major areas of effort are minimally necessary if improvements are to be achieved. First, we must focus on economic independence for female-headed households. This goal requires the reconceptualization and redesign of present welfare programs to include training and support that will allow most young mothers to graduate from the programs.

Second, we must prevent premature sex and pregnancy, building upon the strides black women and girls have made in fertility control and finding ways to encourage greater responsibility on the part of boys and men. We must encourage young black people to pursue education, training, and personal development while they delay pregnancy and family formation.

Finally, black husband-wife families, burdened by racial barriers not experienced by other Americans, should be strengthened through tools such as affirmative action in education, employment, and entrepreneurial opportunities.

Actions such as these are deeply in the national interest, and the renewal of the historic strength of the black family should be a major national goal for the coming decade.

I want to submit the green booklet before you, "Framework for Racial Justice," for your record. The policy framework is not a detailed remedy analysis, although it makes reference to remedies which I will later discuss.

It attempts to engage a new discussion seeking new approaches to what often are a new set of problems, although they are often discussed as if the problems themselves had the same content and contours they had 20 years ago.

The essays in the booklet on blacks in the economy, which by the way is not unrelated to the deterioration of the black family structure—and on black education reflect the notion that some of the old problems have indeed been solved and even when they have not been, new conditions and a different set of pressures require fresh thinking.

The essay in the booklet on the black family is not so much fresh thinking as it is first thinking. This subject has not been the focus of any significant discussion that goes to policy and remedies.

The family, after all, is a largely personal and intimate institution. It is not always easy to discern when the family itself is in trouble.

There has been concern about family life in America in general, as we have seen a 50-percent divorce rate with its attending effects on women and children in particular and the rapid growth of female-headed households.

In one decade, for example, among whites the number of babies born to single women almost doubled from something over 5 percent to almost 10 percent.

Mr. DONNELLY. What decade was that, Doctor?

Ms. NORTON. That was in the 1970's, the past decade. However, the number of babies born to single black women did not increase so rapidly, but the numbers are absolutely extraordinary, for during the same decade the number of babies born to single black women increased from 38 to 55 percent.

Figures showing a majority of black children born to single mothers show up consistently in every part of the country and in virtually every State—from 54 percent in Arkansas and 57 percent in Indiana, to 63 percent in Wisconsin and 60 percent in New Jersey.

These are figures of crisis proportion because of the strong correlation between poverty and female-headed households with children.

Black women, subject to both sex and race discrimination, will find it especially difficult to raise children alone. For example, in 1979, median income for all families was $20,000 in this country; for black female-headed families, it was $6,610. The large increase in poor female-headed households is already by itself retracting the very substantial gains made by black people as a whole as a result of the passage of the three great civil rights acts and of the Great Society programs.

For example, we see very substantial progress in reducing the gap between black and white individual income, a very substantial decrease of the gap since the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Moreover, black husband-wife family income experienced substantial growth in income in the seventies while black female-headed households regressed. If the large increase in female-headed households had not occurred in the 1970's, black family income would have increased by 11.3 percent instead of decreasing by 5 percent and, thus, would have grown at a faster rate in the 1970's than white family income did.

The sole reason black family income did not grow was the great growth of black female-headed households. If these are the households having the majority of black children today—and the figures indicate they are—then you do not have to be much of a mathematician to figure out that we could end up with a greater proportion of disadvantaged black people in the next generation than in this, considering the correlation between poverty and economic, social, and educational disadvantage.

Thus, the search for remedies has become especially urgent. These remedies are complicated.

They must involve both the black community itself and the Government. The Government is deeply implicated in the deterioration of the black family, beginning with slavery, up to the present moment when Government policies continue to act to the detriment of the black families.

First, of course, we have to focus on prevention. If we don't, whatever actions we take we will simply replace present black female-headed households with new ones.

It is like trying to mop up water that is coming down onto the floor without turning the faucet off. The way to turn the faucet off, of course, is to deal with prevention of large numbers of or disproportionate numbers of black births among very young women, especially teenagers and other single women.

Interestingly, the black birth rate has declined dramatically since the 1960's and, indeed, the rate of births among blacks has declined more rapidly than among whites.

Today, for example, you do not see welfare recipients very often who have six or seven or eight children as you might have seen 20 or 25 years ago. In fact, black women have taken very particular advantage of birth preventitives and abortion where they have been available.

Yet there needs to be much more study and much more activity both in the private sector and with Government help to raise more forcefully the notion of delaying sex and early pregnancy to both boys and girls.

We have gotten to the point where we don't talk about it any longer. We assume it happens and we don't know quite how to talk to our own children even through organizations in our own communities.

What encourages boys and girls to delay pregnancy is belief in the future. When you live in deteriorating, devastated ghetto communities that today receive virtually no help from the Government, there is very little reason to understand that there is something to be gained by delaying child bearing.

Second, of course, we have an urgent problem on our hands and we cannot afford to wait a moment longer. That is to deal with the existing plight of families headed by women.

First, we have to focus on the major program, the only program that purports to deal with them. This is the AFDC program.

It needs total redesign, indeed, reconceptualization. We need to think it through as if we were starting on an entirely clean slate.

Some ways to think it through might be to ask ourselves where it is we want to get. The counterpart of the young woman who is 18 or 20 and on AFDC is often in a Government-supported training program or getting a Pell grant to go to college.

The early pregnancy has meant that her counterpart of the same age has no opportunities to get the skills to become self-sufficient, though the woman with the child is ever so much more in need of that economic self-sufficiency; and if she doesn't get it, of course, society will have to take care of her.

But, in fact, the figures are devastating. Of girls who get pregnant, 80 to 90 percent drop out of school, and the school systems which feel strapped have not very much incentive to be particularly sensitive to the need to encourage young pregnant girls to stay in school.

One thing the Government might do and might profit from doing would be to offer incentives to school systems to operate programs for the retention of pregnant girls in school and for their retention in school after they become mothers.

The money the Government would save if these women were able to finish school and then go to the job market is itself a very substantial amount. AFDC, I think, ought to be put into perspective. It is obviously stretched beyond its original purpose. It was a brilliantly conceived program.

It was meant in the 1930's to deal with society's exceptions, the very few women who were then separated or divorced, it made perfect sense.

It was also meant occasionally to tide people over and to do so in bad times. Today this program, this single program has been stretched to take care of the victims of structural unemployment, of historic racial discrimination, of generational poverty and any other hard luck that befalls a woman.

Studies of the hardcore poor show these women, women like those you have been privileged to hear at this very table, to be the most successful among all the hardcore poor in training for work, and the most enthusiastic about finding work.

The fact that they have minor children may, indeed, constitute its own incentive for them to work. Yet, we in this country have essentially the same maintenance approach toward these young women as we have toward the elderly and handicapped who cannot work at all.

Here are young people in the prime of their lives, educable, willing to work, trainable, and we have decided to maintain them instead of to help graduate them from maintenance.

There has never been, I submit, even with the WIN program, a serious effort to train and make self-sufficient our welfare recipients. An example of a program that will have almost no relevance to them is the new Job Training and Partnerhsip Act program—and we are glad to see anybody trained who can be trained—but we have to understand what we are doing.

In that program we are skimming off the most advantaged of the unemployed, helping industry to train them—some of whom industry might train anyway, by the way—but helping them to do so in a good partnership with industry.

I don't think anyone seriously believes that that program will reach most or even a tiny fraction of welfare recipients. The program is not designed to do so. It doesn't provide grants for taking care of the children of welfare recipients. It simply is not designed to meet the most disadvantaged among the unemployed.

Therefore, we have nowhere on the books a program which will, with all our talk about the feminization of poverty, will lead most women and children toward any prospect for training.

This is very serious, particularly when you consider the rapid growth of these female-headed households. The Rockefeller Foundation Board—on whose board I serve—has recently given a large grant, several million dollars, $7 million or $8 million, to six community-based organizations, two Hispanic, four black, in the cities across this country. Two are in New York, Congresswoman Ferraro.

They are for the purpose of training single minority mothers and help them find work. The training and placement also has a child care component so the woman has some place to leave her children while she is seeking training and work.

I want to emphasize that it is not easy to train society's most disadvantaged people—those are most often who welfare recipients are—to find work in the private sector.

The Rockefeller program is being closely monitored because we would like to know whether a program of its kind could indeed be a model or a prototype for redesign of the welfare system.

My own feeling, and the results are far from in now, is that given the increasing noncompetitiveness of the American economy it is folly to believe that we are going to be able to train welfare recipients to compete on an equal basis in the private market with others who are seeking jobs.

I mean, I am looking for evidence that this might not be the case, but putting into the equation the kind of employment market we have today—and it looks like we have it now for the foreseeable future—given the fact that welfare itself is a stigma on top of another stigma, the color stigma or ethnic stigma, on top of the discrimination that flows from being female, I wonder how realistic it is to believe that there are places in the private job market or will be in the foreseeable future for welfare recipients.

Many of the students I teach at Georgetown, brilliantly well prepared people when they get there, who go away from Georgetown with a first-class education, are finding it hard to find jobs as lawyers. Many people go to graduate school because they can't find jobs in the private sector.

Now, we ask welfare recipients to go out and find jobs in a country that never has had a full employment economy and has less and less of one as we go along. Thus, I think if we are going to truly, truly seek solutions here we have to look at some mix that includes public service jobs, which in my judgment will be far more cost effective than simply maintaining young people who clearly could work if given a chance.

Not only is the Rockefeller program, I think, a hopeful sign that something may emerge to pattern a new welfare program after—and I call it a welfare program only advisedly because I think most of the people on welfare could graduate from the program if it was structured for graduation instead of maintenance—but the Joint Center, whom I speak for today, has recently received a grant from the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation to carry on the work of the Tarrytown Group of black scholars.

The next mission of that group is to recommend public and private strategies which I believe will include legislative strategies for dealing with what we regard as a very complicated problem. Much is at stake here, and there are much larger stakes than in your ordinary training program or your ordinary concern for poor people. These are the mothers as it turns out of most of the black children of the next generation. Black husband-wife families are having few children, like most young people today. Black women on welfare don't have many children, either. But if black husband-wife families have one and single mothers have two, then you can see what we will have in only a few years.

If we can contain their problems, their disadvantage—which is often passed on to them from prior generations—if we can contain it in their generation, they will not then be the carriers of that disadvantage to the next generation. If not, many of the current efforts underway to eradicate poverty and society's other problems simply won't have any effect. We are in effect dealing with the symptoms of most problems when we deal with juvenile delinquency, with drug abuse, with crime, with failure in school, with the dropout rate. We are dealing with problems that flow often from the first 5 years of life in female-headed households of the most disadvantaged kind. They flow disproportionately from just such environments.

By focusing on these families we can prevent many of the social problems that arise in the society at large. And it is clear that these problems originate from the conditions bred by poverty and disadvantage in female-headed households. Not all to be sure, but an extraordinarily disproportionate number of them do. It should not be lost on us that middle-class children from traditional or extended families whether they are black or white or Hispanic, or whatever, do not have the problems that poor children from female-headed households do.

Thus concentrating on rehabilitating these families, it seems to us, could take care of many of the other problems we are spending billions of dollars on.

We must find a way to penetrate the barriers that have sealed off these families from help and from hope. The black family has been a brilliantly adaptive institution in a country where racist and economic hostility would have long ago destroyed a weaker family structure. But after 300 years of struggle and resiliency, black families, especially female-headed families, need special attention. The historic creative capacities of the black family have been greatly taxed by today's conditions. But the family is still much revered among American blacks. A focus on the black family in whatever form it is found has enormous potential to radiate improvements in the status of black people and to eliminate the problems that remain.

Thank you very much.

[Testimony resumes on p. 67.]

[The prepared statement of Dr. Norton, along with the Tarrytown Group document, follows:]

Opening Remarks of Eleanor Holmes Norton

Professor of Law

Georgetown University Law Center

Summarizing "The Black Family" from

A Policy Framework for Racial Justice

Testimony Before the House Budget Committee Task
Force on Entitlements, Uncontrollables, and
Indexing, Thursday, October 27, 1983.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today on behalf of the Joint Center for Political Studies and the Tarrytown Group of black scholars. The document produced by the Tarrytown Group, brought together by the Joint Center in 1981 and 1982, represents an attempt to rethink some of the major problems confronting the black community today. The statement entitled "The Black Family" is the first statement of its kind on this delicate and important subject produced by a group of black thinkers. For this reason, it has been given special weight in discussions of the black family that are only now beginning among concerned Americans.

In summary, the Tarrytown Group concluded that the most striking measure of the cumulative effect of American racism today is the precipitous reduction in the strength of the black family. Its repair is central to any serious strategy to improve the black condition.

No group brought a stronger family tradition to America than blacks, whose family life incorporated the patterns of African societies that were organized around kinship and family itself.

Not until the 1960's did black family life--after generations of corrosive governmental and societal policies--meet ultimately destabilizing forces: migration that was often virtually compulsory, rapid urbanization and ghettoization, and structural unemployment. As a result, almost half of all black families are now headed by women. Most seriously, more than half of all black children are raised by single mothers, many of whom are teenagers themselves and most of whom are poor. Some of the most vexing problems of the black community, especially hard-core proverty and its consequences, can be traced to family structures that have been weakened by racism and its continuing effects.

Three major areas of effort are minimally necessary if improvements are to be achieved. First, we must focus on economic independence for female-headed households. This goal requires the reconceptualization and redesign of present welfare programs to include training and support that will allow most young mothers to graduate from the programs.

Second, we must prevent premature sex and pregnancy, building upon the strides black women and girls have made in fertility control and finding ways to encourage greater responsibility on the part of boys and men. We must encourage young black people to pursue education, training and personal development while they delay pregnancy and family formation.

Finally, black husband-wife families, burdened by racial barriers not experienced by other Americans, should be strengthened through tools such as affirmative action in education, employment and entrepreneurial opportunities.

Actions such as these are deeply in the national interest, and the renewal of the historic strength of the black family should be a major national goal for the coming decade.

A POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR RACIAL JUSTICE

With a foreword by
KENNETH B. CLARK
AND
JOHN HOPE FRANKLIN

Joint Center for Political Studies
Washington, D.C. 1983

The Joint Center for Political Studies is a national nonprofit institution that conducts research on public policy issues of special concern to black Americans and promotes informed and effective involvement of blacks in the governmental process. Founded in 1970, the Joint Center provides independent and nonpartisan analyses through research, publication, and outreach programs.

Opinions expressed in Joint Center publications are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the staff, officers, or governors of the Joint Center or of the organizations supporting the center and its research.

ISBN 0-941410-30-7
Copyright © 1983, Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc.
All Rights Reserved
Printed in the United States of America
Joint Center for Political Studies
1301 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20004

Acknowledgments

This publication and the meetings that led to it were made possible by grants from the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, the Field Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Johnson Foundation, the New World Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation.

Foreword

W. E. B. DuBois stated in the early 1940s that the most difficult stage in the struggle for racial justice in America would be reached when it became clear that fundamental inequities persisted in spite of litigation, legislation, and direct confrontation. The success or failure of the civil rights struggle, he said, would ultimately be determined by the ability of a highly trained group of black scholars to use their disciplined intelligence as effective weapons in the battle for social justice.

DuBois' prescience may be seen by the profound racial inequities that persist today. They persist despite the progress generated by the *Brown* decision of 1954, despite the civil rights laws of 1964 and 1965, despite the non-violent civil disobedience movement directed by Martin Luther King, Jr., and despite the sporadic urban riots of the late 1960s. We are indeed at the most difficult stage in the quest for racial justice.

Ironically, the successes of the civil rights movement of the 1960s, achieved by methods appropriate to that time, revealed the depth and complexity of American racism and led, in a sense, to the current need to re-examine some basic assumptions and to search for remedies that will be effective in the 1980s.

Contemporary racial problems cannot be dramatized by television pictures of cattle prods being used against those seeking relief from blatant forms of injustice. The chief barriers to racial justice today are subtle and much less conducive to media coverage. Such problems as inferior schools in northern cities that resist attempts at desegregation, deteriorating urban ghettos, persistent unemployment and underemployment, and the myriad handicaps of single-parent black families do not elicit the same moral indignation on the part of the American public as did earlier forms of injustice.

Americans must be shown that the problems at this stage are no less intolerable than the earlier ones. Then, appropriate responses must be developed and effectively communicated. These are the tasks that DuBois assigned to the educationally and intellectually advantaged members of the black community.

In the late 1970s a number of black scholars, under the leadership of the late Judge William Hastie, came together informally and quietly to exchange ideas concerning the increasingly complex and difficult state of the civil rights movement. The early meetings of this group centered on the rise of black separatism and particularly the frustration that young black college students expressed in their regressive demands for a return to racially segregated facilities. Later meetings involved discussions and suggestions on how to address these problems within the larger framework of seeking racial justice. No written statement emerged, largely because of the sporadic and *ad hoc* nature of the meetings. Some members of the group, however, continued to give thought to the problems canvassed and to explore strategies for their solution.

In 1979, the Joint Center asked the two of us to prepare a statement that would set forth some of the major problems black Americans faced in the 1980s—"to sketch out a common experience in the vineyard of civil rights," as the Joint Center put it, "and to alert us to the unfinished tasks which lie ahead." The result was an essay called *The Nineteen Eighties: Prologue and Prospect.* We observed that, in spite of landmark court decisions, major legislation at the federal and state levels, and executive initiatives of an unprecedented nature, racial problems in the United States persisted, especially in the areas of employment, education, housing, and family life. We concluded that it was difficult, "at the beginning of the 1980s, to be optimistic about the future of blacks in American society." It was imperative, we said, "that new perspectives, strategies, and methods be developed to deal with today's complex racial realities."

The Nineteen Eighties: Prologue and Prospect drew considerable response and suggestions for further study and elaboration. Some responses emphasized the importance not only of developing and refining ideas but of making certain that they become a part of the mechanisms for the improvement of society. These suggestions led the Joint Center to call a conference at Tarrytown, New York, on July 29-30, 1981. Some thirty citizens and scholars met for two days and explored the vast array of problems black Americans face in the closing decades of the twentieth century.[1] Using *Prologue and Prospect* as a point of departure, the participants brought to the discussion their own special skills in such areas as law, politics, sociology, history, anthropology, and literature.

While the discussions were rewarding, there was not sufficient time to delineate the problem areas requiring the most urgent attention. But the group agreed that the ideas explored at the conference should become, as one participant put it, "elements in the action process." Consequently, the Joint Center convened a second Tarrytown conference on November 19-21, 1982, out of which emerged the statement that follows.

As part of the "action process," the Joint Center, in cooperation with the Johnson Foundation, convened a third conference involving representatives of the Tarrytown group and members of the Black Leadership Forum.[2] The purpose of the meeting, held at the foundation's Wingspread Conference Center in Racine, Wisconsin, on March 23-25, 1983, was to review and refine the Tarrytown statement.

---

[1] Participants in the Tarrytown conferences are listed in Appendix B.

[2] Participants in the Wingspread conference are listed in Appendix C.

We hope that the ideas contained in this document will encourage widespread discussion and that out of such discussions will come strategies to achieve social and racial justice in America.

Kenneth B. Clark
John Hope Franklin
May 1983

Introduction

At least three societies exist in America today: the mainstream, the assimilated minorities, and the excluded. These three societies are separate and unequal and the disparities among them threaten to destroy the national fabric.

The excluded are a relatively new social species, comprising people who are chronically poor, unemployed, or underemployed. Black Americans, because of historic problems of discrimination, are disproportionately represented among the excluded. Their condition worsens. At a time of national economic stringency, affirmative action and "safety net" commitments are vanishing. The resistance to social equity is fierce.

Indeed, now that the drive for civil rights of the 50s, 60s, and 70s has been blunted, the fundamental question is squarely before us: Is America willing to support equitable social policies? The present answer to that question is a resounding "no." That answer is stimulated by a powerful and continuing climate of racism, and it has been given force and virulence by the nation's experience with the worst economic conditions since the Great Depression and by long-term economic uncertainties.

Under the best of circumstances, blacks have faced major obstacles in their quest for full social and economic citizenship. But as the economic pie has stopped growing over the past several years, national cynicism and misanthropy have reached new peaks. The current situation differs significantly from the past in that there is not only resistance to further advances toward equity but also a deep resentment in some quarters toward the advances already made. That resentment has been forged into sharp attacks on efforts, such as affirmative action, that were designed to continue the drive toward equity. The new atmosphere of racism with its code-word vocabulary—"reverse discrimination," "excessive domestic spending," "make-work jobs," and so on—is more pervasive than at any time since the early years of the century. Moreover, natural and in some cases historic allies now view each other with suspicion when they are not actually pursuing divisive socio-political strategies.

For far too long the poor, the black, the brown, and the powerless have been blamed for America's social and economic problems. The fundamental truth is that far from causing the problems, they have been particularly victimized by them. For example, no group has suffered a more devastating assault upon its family structure than black Americans. With the possible exception of Native Americans, no other group has suffered greater deprivation of educational opportunity.

Unless major efforts quickly bring the excluded into the mainstream, the condition of a large portion of the black population will deteriorate beyond the point where any program of intervention can be effective. We believe the most urgent problems facing the excluded blacks can best be addressed by focusing on three areas: the progress of the economy, the condition of the black family, and educational opportunity. These critical areas clearly overlap, and none can be dealt with alone. But they provide a framework for constructing solutions to the real, structural failures in the society and not just the superficial cracks and tears. If comprehensive action is taken in these areas, not only blacks but American society as a whole will benefit.

A major barrier to such action is the short-sightedness from which this country has always suffered: Its refusal to understand that to exclude blacks from the mainstream undermines the society at large. This short-sightedness also prevents America from understanding that domestic racial inequities weaken its position in the world—at precisely the time when global forces increasingly influence the internal as well as the external policies of the United States.

The continuing conflict between the United States and the USSR, with its worldwide implications, has led this country to allocate to defense budgets a surfeit of resources that might otherwise be available to improve the quality of life for American citizens. The worldwide energy crisis and international trade problems reinforce the intimate relationship between domestic and foreign policies. So, too, do the increased mobility of capital, the rapid advance in technology, and the concomitant loss of jobs and entire industries to overseas markets. The search by millions of refugees for havens is further evidence of the impossibility of isolation. In short, our earth has shrunk so much in this century that significant human and political problems can only be understood in global terms. We believe that no material plan of action can succeed that fails to acknowledge the global context within which any reform must take place.

We believe, too, that Americans must face the likelihood that greater—not less—government intervention and planning are required to revitalize the national economy. Rather than flinching from an enhanced government role, we must proceed intelligently to develop new and effective roles for government as well as to adapt models and experiences of other countries to American traditions and circumstances. Just as social security was borrowed from Europe and adapted to America in the 1930s, so the challenge today is to look for new ideas to revive our economy.

Unfortunately, the last presidential election helped to foster the myth that there was a leviathan federal government on Americans' backs and that it had to be lifted, however painfully, in pursuit of the American dream. The truth, of course, is that the role of our government in the social sector is far smaller than in other countries, including Great Britain, Germany, and France. To be sure, Western European economies are embattled today, but theirs would appear to be a more constructive and promising approach, even as they struggle. Indeed, the problems of those societies as well as our own signal structural defects in the global order, which defy parochial solutions. The lesson is clear. Just as minority problems often demand mainstream solutions, national economic malfunctions often demand international remedies.

But while the remedies must be both broad and fundamental, they must not take for granted that their effects will trickle down to those who have been left further and further behind in the past. The present economic upswing may continue, for example, without ever restoring jobs to all who have lost them, and without bringing down the unconscionable unemployment rates for blacks even to the level of current, "unacceptable" unemployment rates for whites. The renewed national interest in education policy could leave blacks in ghetto schools at an even greater disadvantage, if programs are not targeted at the desperate conditions of these institutions. Increasing opportunities for some may be no opportunity at all for poverty-stricken, female-headed households and the children raised in them. A rising tide may simply swamp boats with hulls decaying from centuries of abuse and neglect.

Americans must recognize both the immorality and the practical cost of perpetuating a class of the excluded. And a true commitment to end this state of affairs must accept specially targeted programs as an indispensable component.

This is by no means to say we do not seek coalitions with other groups. Under present national policies, Americans of many backgrounds are rapidly joining the ranks of the victims. Out of this dismal present, the prospect of potent coalition politics looms far more promisingly than ever before. Linkages among blacks and disadvantaged Hispanics, chastened organized labor, radicalized farmers, disenchanted women, across-class peace movements, and others can surely materialize.

But coalitions cannot succeed without a program. This statement should serve to indicate the needs and aspirations that must be the basis of any program the black community can unequivocally support.

The Economy

One of the legacies of racial oppression in America is that a large segment of the black population is structurally excluded from the American economy. This heterogeneous grouping of families and individuals is, in several important respects, more socially and economically isolated today than it was before the civil rights victories of the 1960s. Unlike stable working class and middle-class black families, this impoverished population has not only experienced growing problems of joblessness (unemployment, underemployment, and labor dislocation), but it has also been handicapped by rising rates of single parent (mostly female-headed) households, out-of-wedlock births, welfare dependency, and violent crime.

Although current racial discrimination helps to perpetuate these forms of social dislocation, they have been exacerbated in recent years by problems in the American economy that ostensibly have little or nothing to do with race, problems that fall heavily on much of the black population but require solutions that confront the broader issues of societal organization.

PROBLEMS IN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

For several decades urban America has been undergoing what seems to be an irreversible process of deindustrialization. Our larger cities are being transformed from centers of production and distribution of physical goods to centers of finance, information exchange, trade, government services, and administration. This has resulted in the loss of millions of manufacturing, wholesale, and retail jobs since 1948, a trend that has accelerated since 1967. (New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia alone lost a combined total of about 800,000 manufacturing, wholesale, and retail jobs between 1967 and 1977.) At the same time, there has been an increase in the number of jobs spawned by new technology and the rapidly advancing "post-industrial society." These jobs usually have new and higher training and educational requirements, which the disadvantaged, more often than not, are powerless to meet. Accompanying these shifts in employment patterns have been changes in the demographic composition of central cities from predominantly white (mainly European) to predominantly black, Hispanic, and other minority groups. As a result, not only has total population size of central cities decreased, but the aggregate personal income levels have decreased as well.

The combined effect of these technology/employment shifts and demographic changes has been a growing mismatch between the skill or training level of the population and the urban job opportunities; increased ghettoization; and the crystallization of poverty. Institutional problems (such as inadequate schools and municipal services, and the deterioration of commercial and residential areas) and social dislocations (such as joblessness, family deterioration, and welfare dependency) are at a crisis level.

If urban blacks are experiencing growing problems in "post-industrial society," the nation's 6,000,000 rural blacks have also been victimized by recent changes in the American economy. The rural black poor have always been a significant part of the American poverty population, but in recent years their situation has been complicated by the increasing mechanization of agriculture. In the Mississippi Delta, for example, the black part of the economy has been virtually eliminated, leading one observer to note that "what was once malnutrition and accumulated disease has become virtual starvation." In recent years, rural blacks have sought relief from declining employment opportunities in agriculture by migrating to urban centers, but this option is now less favorable, owing to the fiscal crises in both southern and northern metropolises that have accompanied nationwide economic stagnation.

For all these reasons, we believe policies that do not take into account the changing characteristics of the national economy—including its rate of growth and demand for labor, including factors that affect industrial employment such as investment and technology, and including demographic changes that accompany industrial transformations—cannot possibly respond effectively to the economic and social dislocations of low-income blacks. This segment of the population is particularly vulnerable to the structural economic changes that have accompanied the shift from goods-producing to service-producing industries, such as the increasing segmentation of the labor market, the growing use of industrial technology, and the relocation of industries out of the central city to the suburbs, to the sunbelt, and even to other countries around the world. As emphasized in a recent study on deindustrialization of America, blacks are not only "concentrated within central cities and, in those regions of the country where plant closings and economic dislocations have been most pronounced," they also tend to be "concentrated in industries that have borne the brunt of recent closings."

TOWARD A NEW ECONOMIC POLICY

Economic stagnation not only creates massive dislocations, it also necessitates greater expenditures to ameliorate human suffering. For example, for every 1 percent yearly rise in unemployment, the government has to pay 20 billion dollars in unemployment compensation, welfare, and health costs. Thus, in the face of a contracting tax base and taxpayer revolts, the excluded are caught in a bone-crushing vise. Unfortunately, unlike in many other western democracies, the United States government has had little leverage over either the capital market or the labor market, even during periods preceding the current "free market" approach to economic problems.

There are compelling justifications for the government to help generate conditions that provide a job at a decent wage level for everyone willing and able to work. *We emphasize full employment at a decent wage level to underscore the importance of providing working families with an income that not only allows them to exist above mere subsistence levels but also strengthens work incentives.*

To achieve the goal of full employment at a decent wage level, we believe there has to be *rational* government involvement in the economy. This might include, among other things, the use of institutional mechanisms such as tax credits and direct grants that could direct more capital toward rebuilding urban infrastructure and thereby create jobs, and the use of a variety of tax and income supplementation schemes to raise the wage levels of the less skilled jobs. Regardless of which specific actions are taken, however, government involvement in the economy should be based on rational schemes designed to insure that all Americans have access to opportunities for economic success. To put the matter slightly differently, we are recommending a shift from ad hoc strategies to a comprehensive and rational economic policy—a shift from strategies designed to meet immediate problems to strategies thought out in advance and consistently pursued.

A rational economic policy would systematically address questions usually ignored when ad hoc strategies are discussed and recommended, including questions concerning the relative impact of proposed economic programs on labor markets in different regions of the country; the variety and volume of jobs to be generated; the extent to which these jobs will be available to residents in low-income neighborhoods; the quality of these jobs in terms of wages and stability; the extent to which the proposed economic programs enhance the employment opportunities of both the currently unemployed and the new entrants into the labor market; and whether the benefits accrued from economic development and employment represent reasonable returns on public investment.

For all these reasons, *we especially see the need for the creation of a general economic policy (integrating social policy with industrial and labor market policies) built upon a social contract between business, labor, professional associations, and government.* This contract would be the foundation for a consensus-making organization working more or less within a public framework to bargain and initiate policies on questions of economic growth, unemployment, prices, taxes, balance of payments, and social policy. In periods of rising expectations and slow economic growth, such an arrangement would compel labor—concerned with wages, social security, and working conditions—to be attentive to matters of productivity, the requirements of investments, and the levels of inflation; and would compel employers—concerned with profits, investments, and productivity—to be attentive to matters of social policy (including various forms of welfare policies, housing, health, and education).

Thus, a general economic policy would result in long-term planning to promote both sustained full employment and economic growth, not only in certain "privileged" areas but also in areas where the poor are concentrated. Such an economic policy would ensure price and wage stability, maintain favorable conditions of employment, protect equal opportunity employment, and develop and integrate manpower training programs with education programs.

After full employment is reached, current forms of means-tested and stigmatizing public assistance programs should be gradually replaced by more universal forms of social welfare, such as family allowances and child care centers, which provide incentives for people to work and which break the cycle of dependency. Public assistance would be used only for those who have special handicaps that render them incapable of working.

We are not standing alone in calling for fundamental economic reform. There is an emerging consensus on the need for rational government involvement in the economy. For example, the question of a comprehensive industrial policy is being seriously discussed in a number of quarters, including position papers prepared for the Democratic presidential candidates.

As University of Michigan political scientist Ernest J. Wilson III points out, in a paper prepared for the Joint Center for Political Studies, "If the industrial policy rhetoric is converted into party political platforms, and the platforms become policy, then the ensuing shifts in the structure of national opportunity will dramatically affect black employment opportunities, prospects for education and training, access to business and personal credit, and a host of other aspects of black economic and social life." There are two reasons, therefore, why the black leadership should give serious attention to matters of economic organization: (1) the present arrangement of the economy has had deleterious consequences for large segments of the black population, most notably low-income blacks; and (2) if current discussions of economic reform—whether in the form of an industrial policy or a more comprehensive economic policy integrating industrial and labor market policies with social policies—ultimately become adopted as national policy, then the economic interests of blacks will have to be protected and promoted. Accordingly, black leaders, policymakers, and intellectuals ought to be involved in every major step in the policy formation process, including what will surely be a debate on industrial policy in the formulation of the Democratic party platform in 1984.

The recommendations in this report should signal to interested parties that black thinkers are addressing the issue of economic organization in America and that black involvement in the formulation of economic policy is crucial if that policy is to receive sufficient political support.

The Black Family

Accumulated social and economic pressures, feeding upon the long-standing effects of American racism, have produced a special crisis for the black family today. This crisis underlies many problems facing the black community, especially entrenched poverty, which is closely correlated to the pronounced vulnerability of the large and growing number of black families headed by single mothers. No strategy designed to improve the status of black Americans can ignore the central position of the black family as the natural transmitter of the care, values, and opportunities necessary for black men, women, and children to reach their full potential as individuals.

THE ROOTS OF THE PRESENT CRISIS

The present black family crisis, characterized chiefly by the precipitous growth of poor female-headed households, can be traced almost directly to American racism. Black Americans came to this country as slaves from a society where family was the central framework for the organization of society itself. Black American family traditions derive from African societies that were organized around kinship and so committed to responsibility, even for the most distant of kin, that there were virtually no random or disconnected individuals, much less broken families. This heritage survived in America in the extended family, a continuing source of strength for blacks today.

But this strong family tradition had to contend first with the slave system, then with legal segregation, discrimination, and enforced poverty and finally with racially hostile governmental and societal policies, practices and attitudes. These forces have finally weakened a family fabric that had for generations proved unusually resilient, even in the face of awesome adversity. Indeed, until the 1960s, a remarkable 75 percent of black families included both husband and wife.

Since the 1960s, rapid urbanization, and especially ghettoization, has had a devastating impact on many black families. As large numbers of blacks migrated to large cities from rural areas, black males have often been unable to find work, and government policies and other social forces further sapped family strength. These trends proceed apace today, aided by the widespread failure even to recognize the pressures on the black family as central to other problems and by the failure to devise both preventive and healing strategies.

THE DIMENSIONS OF THE PROBLEM

The most serious manifestation of increasing difficulty in black family formation and stability is the recent sharp rise in female-headed households. Today 48 percent of black families with related children under 18 are headed by women and half of all black children under 18 live in female-headed households. These households are not inherently less appropriate for the care and raising of children. But the 1979 median income for black female-headed households was only $6,610 compared with close to $20,000 for all families. This and virtually every socioeconomic indicator confirm the unique difficulties such families encounter.

The rate of poverty among female-headed families has led many experts to conclude that American poverty is rapidly becoming a condition identified chiefly with women and children. Black birth patterns contribute disproportionately to this trend. In 1979, the majority of black births occurred to single mothers—in every part of the country, from Arkansas (54 percent) and Indiana (57 percent) to Wisconsin (63 percent) and New Jersey (60 percent).

Female-headed households arise from a number of different circumstances. A rising number emerge from teenage pregnancies, and a permanent male partner to contribute to the economic and other responsibilities of family life is absent from the start. The consequences are predictable. Children grow up with few consistent male role models. In many cases, the young mothers of these children are themselves hardly removed from childhood—their education is incomplete, their preparation for parenthood underdeveloped, and their own personal potential unfulfilled.

Even when female-headed households are not poor, such families often incur severe difficulties in maintaining family life. Black women are subject to both sex and race discrimination and are victims of an income gap that causes them to earn less than 60 percent of male income. When this diminished earning capacity is combined with the practical problems of full-time work, inadequate child-care arrangements, and the often total responsibility for child rearing, these women and their children are at considerable risk.

Also contributing to the growing number of female-headed households is the high rate of divorce and separation among black couples. About 34 percent of black female-headed households are the result of the break-up of marriages. Black marriages are beset with the special problems of their race on top of the destabilizing forces that have injured the family life of virtually all Americans. The fragility of black family life is underscored by their higher rate of divorce and separation and their lower rate of remarriage, than those of other Americans.

REBUILDING BLACK FAMILY STRUCTURE

Family-related factors such as these constitute an important key to understanding the continuing and resistant problems of black people today. The slowing of economic progress and the increase in poverty in the black community derive in no small part from the cumulative effect on families of racism and economic and social disadvantage. But policies and strategies that focus on the black family as a vehicle for providing and transmitting opportunities are in their infancy and urgently need development. Government, researchers, and community organizations alike can make vital contributions.

The rapid growth of female-headed households in particular can and must be reversed. Unfortunately, the government has no coherent programs or policies to address the problems that destabilize black families. Yet the cost to government of this neglect is great. Punitive and cost-cutting measures that focus on poor female household heads as undeserving recipients of government benefits have done nothing to control the growth of such households. Surely, it is time to admit that more fundamental solutions are necessary. Government has the resources to search for effective solutions. What is required is the political will.

By now it is beyond debate that *government assistance programs for poor mothers need to be completely reconceptualized and redesigned*. The only major program directed at poor female-headed families, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, was conceived as a stopgap measure to enable families to survive during periods of economic distress. The program has been stretched to cover families who are victims of racism and structural unemployment, but the results have been unsatisfactory AFDC needs to be replaced with approaches that lead families toward economic independence. Considering the youth of most AFDC recipients, the dominant mission of any program that serves them should be to provide the requisite training and support to enable them to graduate from the AFDC program, just as the government provides funds to help other young women graduate from programs of higher education and specialized training.

Ultimately, the economic and human benefits of a program to equip poor single mothers for work will outweigh any investment by the government in such an approach. The responsiveness of black female household heads to job and education programs and the extraordinary desire they show for work suggest that this approach, if rigorously developed, would be immensely fruitful.

Moreover, if current patterns are to be reversed, preventive action will be as important as actions to help existing female-headed households. *Teenagers and young men and women need to be encouraged to pursue education, training, work and personal development while they delay pregnancy and family formation.* Birth rates for blacks of all backgrounds have dropped significantly over the last few decades; it is the proportion of births to single women that has grown. A specific focus on all aspects of family planning would build upon the success of black women and girls in fertility control. For young people, there is a special need for sex education and education about the importance to their own futures of delaying sex, pregnancy, and marriage. These and other strategies that encourage young people to believe in and prepare for the future are all a part of encouraging more stable family patterns. With greater community and government efforts, a significant reduction in premature pregnancies is obtainable by the end of this decade.

Private organizations and researchers also have an important contribution to make. With their creativity and flexibility, they have often pioneered solutions, such as legal services for the poor, that have been taken up by government. The Ford and Rockefeller foundations are currently funding programs that hold such promise. These programs, directed at minority single mothers, involve job development and training, utilization of resources such as community residents to assist single mothers, and child care. These initiatives could become useful models for larger programs to help single mothers become economically self-sufficient, dispel myths about the black family, and build upon the existing strengths of black family units.

A *major national goal for this decade should be to arrest the proliferation of disadvantaged female-headed black families.* Family reenforcement constitutes the single most important action the nation can take toward the elimination of black poverty and related social problems.

The national interest also requires reenforcing the stability of black husband-wife families. Black husband-wife families experienced growth in income during the 1970s, while black female-headed households retrogressed. If the increase in female-headed households had not occurred, black family income would have increased by 11.3 percent instead of decreasing by 5 percent. Black husband-wife families provide the foundation for a permanent black middle class.

Because its development has been delayed by barriers not experienced by other Americans, this new middle class needs uninterrupted access to education and job mobility to ensure its permanence. Technical training, higher education, and employment and entrepreneurial opportunities for members will reinforce family cohesion. Affirmative action in all these areas will be an important means of broadening access to middle-income opportunities.

Finally the black community itself, especially black organizations, constitute the natural leadership in any effort to help restore black famililes to their historic strength. Black institutions such as churches, civil rights organizations, fraternities, sororities, young people's groups, and other community organizations have been a source of strength to the black community over the years. The black family as a unit needs the strong, caring concern and protection of the black community, its innovative leadership and its strong organizational life. From family counseling to family planning, black organizations will often be in the best position to help and to guide.

The black family has been a brilliantly adaptive institution in a country where racial and economic hostility would long ago have destroyed a weaker family structure. But after 300 years of struggle and resiliency, black families need special attention. The historic creative capacities of the black family have been greatly taxed by today's conditions, but the family is still much revered among blacks. A focus on the black family in whatever form it is found has enormous potential to radiate improvements in the status of black people and to eliminate the problems that remain.

Education

Traditionally, public education in the United States has been a key vehicle for upward mobility. The custodians of the American public school system have long prided themselves on their ability to maintain standards of educational quality that have supported this mobility and have made public education a foundation of American democracy.

For black Americans, however, public education has become an instrument for blocking rather than facilitating upward mobility. The failures of our public education system are reflected in the fact that blacks are disproportionately represented among the 72 million Americans who are functionally illiterate. One study reported that 47 percent of all black 17-year-olds are illiterate. Adult illiteracy is a problem of crisis proportions.

The public school education for black children must attack illiteracy at its source and prepare our young people to play a constructive role in an increasingly complex and technologically sophisticated economy. The pool of blacks in higher education needs to be expanded. We believe the stability of American society as a whole depends on the effective education of all children.

Three basic problems must be addressed:

1. the lack of access to *quality* public education for the vast majority of blacks in grades K-12;
2. the inadequate representation of black Americans in post-secondary education degree programs that will provide them with the skills necessary to succeed in a fast changing employment market; and
3. the disproportionate number of black adults who are functionally illiterate.

K-12

We believe it is imperative that policies be developed to attack the problems of public education on a national basis, while allowing local communities to adhere to those policies in accordance with their particular characteristics and needs. *A continuing federal role in financing equal educational opportunity and enforcing school desegregation is essential to any effort to make the education of blacks more effective.*

In order to bring about substantial changes in grades K-12, *school districts must be held accountable for the achievement level of students.* Appropriate policies are also required to protect local school districts from crippling cutbacks in their operating budgets resulting from federal or state legislation.

We believe that all children are entitled to an education that will, at a minimum, provide them with the skills necessary to function effectively in this society. *Education policy should include workable vocational education programs and should emphasize basic skills as well as the development of computer and scientific literacy.*

Parents and the community have roles to play in promoting standards and motivating students to achieve academic excellence. Because victimized black families—teenage mothers, poor, female-headed households—are unable to provide the kind of early education and environment that their children need, an effective education policy requires an effective family policy.

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Equal educational opportunity is essential if there is to be an increase in the numbers and percentages of blacks with advanced degrees. We must focus attention on the problems and prospects of both predominantly black institutions and predominantly white institutions that are attended by large numbers of black students. Because so many black students attend community colleges, revision of higher education master plans are required to increase the opportunity for black students to transfer between two-year and four-year public institutions and between these and research institutions offering post-graduate degrees.

Maintaining adequate student aid from private, state, and federal sources remains the most important way of ensuring the attendance of blacks in institutions of higher education. In addition, greater attention to tutoring and other retention measures will help make sure that students do not go through a revolving door from admissions to flunking out. Affirmative action programs, which provide black faculty and staff access to predominantly white institutions and enhance the learning environment for students in these institutions, must become more productive.

ADULT ILLITERACY

Until K-12 schools are functionally effective for black people there will still be an adult illiteracy problem. *More community attention and effort at* *the state, national, and local levels must be devoted to reducing illiteracy among adults*. Nothing more effectively cuts off employment opportunities and interferes with life's simplest tasks than the absence of full literacy.

The economic benefits from education are not the same for everyone. Whites with high school degrees, for example, have a higher mean income than blacks with college degrees. But everyone benefits from education, and without it some employment opportunities are absolutely out of the question.

We are convinced that dramatic improvement in the education of blacks is essential to the economic development—if not survival—of the black community. We are equally convinced that it is a realistic objective provided the custodians of the system as well as blacks themselves are willing to assign to educational excellence for all students the priority it must have and support the changes that will be required.

Appendix A

Statement by the Black Leadership Forum

In March of this year, it was the good fortune of fourteen members of the Black Leadership Forum to participate in a conference at Wingspread in Racine, Wisconsin, co-sponsored by the Joint Center for Political Studies and the Johnson Foundation. This proved to be an intensive, mind-expanding exchange with the "Tarrytown Group" around many of the issues and proposals set forth in these papers.

If introspection, untested by the world outside, runs the risk of sterility, so it is equally true that action uninformed by serious analytical reflection can become reactive, rudderless, and unproductive.

The mutually respectful give and take of the session at Wingspread was particularly helpful to many of us in the forum. We had the opportunity—and the time—to work toward a more coherent framework for some of our concerns; to join in the challenging of some widely held assumptions; and to benefit from fresh perspectives which more clearly illuminated the past, the present and future of Black America, the nation and the world.

Just as those of us in the forum do not pretend to encompass the total spectrum of activist leadership especially concerned with race and poverty, so was it that the scholars with whom we met at Wingspread stressed the untapped potential represented by their absent colleagues in this country and abroad.

Most of us, in the course of the day-to-day work of our own organizations and of the forum, have drawn in one fashion or another on the expertise and wisdom of academicians and policy analysts. One result of the Wingspread meeting has been a stongly shared resolve to take greater advantage of the opportunities for creative interaction among those who from differing vantage points are attempting to find surer paths out of the critical economic, social, and cultural dilemmas that confront us all.

We hope that these papers will be among the most valuable tools for accomplishing that crucial task.

Black Leadership Forum

Joseph E. Lowery
Chairman

Dorothy I. Height
Vice Chairman

M. Carl Holman
Executive Secretary/Treasurer

Appendix B

Participants in the Tarrytown Conferences, June 29-30, 1981, and November 19-21, 1982

Dr. Bernard Anderson
Director
Division of Social Sciences
The Rockefeller Foundation
New York, New York

Dr. Mary Berry
Professor of History and Law, and
Fellow, Institute for the Study of
Educational Policy
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Derrick Bell, Esquire
Dean
University of Oregon School of Law
Eugene, Oregon

Dr. Haywood Burns
Dean
Urban and Legal Programs
City College of New York
New York, New York

Lisle C. Carter, Jr., Esquire
Verner, Liipfert, Bernhard &
McPherson
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Kenneth B. Clark
President
Clark, Phipps, Clark & Harris
New York, New York

Dr. Mamie Phipps Clark
Treasurer
Clark, Phipps, Clark & Harris
New York, New York

Dr. Jewel Cobb
President
California State University
Fullerton, California

Dr. James Comer
Maurice Falk Professor of Child
Psychiatry, Yale Child Study
Center;
Associate Dean, Yale Medical
School
New Haven, Connecticut

Drew Days, Esquire
Professor
Yale University School of Law
New Haven, Connecticut

Christopher Edley, Jr., Esquire
Assistant Professor
Harvard University School of Law
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Dr. Eleanor Farrar
Vice President
Joint Center for Political Studies
Washington, D.C.

Dr. John Hope Franklin
James B. Duke Professor of History
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. James Gibbs
Professor of Anthropology
Stanford University
Stanford, California

Dr. Bernard Gifford
Dean
Graduate School of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

Charles Hamilton, Esquire
Battle, Fowler, Jaffin, Pierce & Kheel
New York, New York

Patricia Roberts Harris
Former Secretary
U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Matthew Holden, Jr.
Henry L. and Grace M. Doherty Professor of Government & Foreign Affairs
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

Joyce Hughes
Professor
Northwestern University School of Law
Chicago, Illinois

Dr. Walter Leonard
President
Fisk University
Nashville, Tennessee

Sir Arthur Lewis
Professor of Economics
Woodrow Wilson School
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

Dr. David Lewis
Professor of History
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California

Dr. Hylan Lewis
Professor Emeritus
Brooklyn College
New York, New York

Eleanor Holmes Norton
Professor
Georgetown University School of Law
Washington, D.C.

Dr. J. Saunders Redding
Ernest I. White Professor Emeritus of American Studies and Humane Letters
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Dr. William Shack
Dean
Graduate School
University of California
Berkeley, California

Dr. Elliott P. Skinner
Franz Boas Professor
of Anthropology
Columbia University
New York, New York

Dr. Mabel Smythe
Professor of African Studies
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Dr. Howard Stanback
Professor of Economics
New School for Social Research
New York, New York

Roger Wilkins
Senior Fellow
Institute for Policy Studies
Washington, D.C.

Eddie N. Williams
President
Joint Center for Political Studies
Washington, D.C.

Dr. William J. Wilson
Lucy Flower Professor of Urban Sociology
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Appendix C

Participants in the Wingspread Conference, Racine, Wisconsin, March 23-25, 1983

Dr. Bernard Anderson Director
Division of Social Sciences
The Rockefeller Foundation
New York, New York

Dr. Mary Berry
Professor of History and Law, and Fellow, Institute for the Study of Educational Policy
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

*Julius L. Chambers, Esquire
President
NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund
Charlotte, North Carolina

*The Honorable Walter E. Fauntroy
Congressional Black Caucus
Washington, D.C.

Dr. John Hope Franklin
James B. Duke Professor of History
Durham, North Carolina

*Theodore R. Hagans
President
National Business League
Washington, D.C.

*Dorothy I. Height
President
National Council of Negro Women
New York, New York

*Norman Hill
President
A. Philip Randolph Institute
New York, New York

*Dr. M. Carl Holman
President
National Urban Coalition
Washington, D.C.

*Reverend Jesse L. Jackson
National President
Operation PUSH
Chicago, Illinois

*John Jacob
President
National Urban League
New York, New York

*Elton Jolly
National Executive Director
Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

*Coretta Scott King
President
Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Social Change
Atlanta, Georgia

*Dr. Joseph E. Lowery
President
Southern Christian Leadership Conference
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Milton D. Morris
Director of Research
Joint Center for Political Studies
Washington, D.C.

Eleanor Holmes Norton
Professor
Georgetown University School of Law
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Elliott P. Skinner
Franz Boas Professor of Anthropology
Columbia University
New York, New York

*The Honorable Donald Tucker
President
National Black Caucus of Local Elected Officials
Newark, New Jersey

Roger Wilkins
Senior Fellow
Institute for Policy Studies
Washington, D.C.

*Eddie N. Williams
President
Joint Center for Political Studies
Washington, D.C.

Dr. William J. Wilson
Lucy Flower Professor of Urban Sociology
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

* Member of the Black Leadership Forum

Mr. **Donnelly**. Thank you very much, Professor Norton. You point up a very interesting dichotomy in the black community. There is one small segment that seems to be economically progressing whereas there is a majority that seems to be in reality economically regressing. There seems to be, at least in my opinion, a conceptualization in this country that blacks are doing better in this country because of the civil rights legislation that you alluded to.

Ms. **Norton**. Mr. Chairman, the majority are not regressing but the majority of the children are born to the poorest blacks. The majority of the blacks are better off than they were 20 years ago, and the Great Society legislation and the Civil Rights Acts have had enormous effect on the problems of blacks. And this Congress I think is to be commended for the foresight it had in the 1960's to see that we could in fact do much to ameliorate poverty and discrimination.

For example, in 1960, 52 percent of all blacks were poor. By 1970 it was down to a third. We have not moved since then. The difficulty comes from the fact that those who are having children turn out to be the poorest and that the majority of children in the black community are now born to poor people.

Mr. **Donnelly**. You also suggest we have to reconceptualize the entire welfare program. I couldn't agree more. I think we ought to scrap it and start anew.

I am not necessarily sure I have the answers. Let me ask you that question, though.

Ms. **Norton**. The reason that I think the present study that the Joint Center—which is a black think tank—is undertaking is so important is that I don't think there is an easy answer here. I think the answer is going to be rather complicated.

Mr. **Donnelly**. And expensive, in all reality?

Ms. **Norton**. Expensive in the short term, but I think not in the long term. I think that in the short term to start up a program which will have to provide some child care, some training, will be more expensive than what we have now. On the other hand, if we conceive a program that contemplates graduation in some sense of that word, imagine how much money we will save.

The fact is that we could translate the welfare grant we now have, add on to it some training money, and train for jobs, some of which may have to be provided in the public sector—I think it is silly to think that if an employer has before it five people and none show in their background any hard luck or disadvantage that he is going to choose the welfare recipient. We start from that premise that there are many jobs to be accomplished in private as well as public areas—by the way, many welfare recipients can go into private jobs. It is just that you will have disproportionate numbers that are very disadvantaged, sometimes functionally illiterate because of poor education or almost no education. But if you start from the assumption that there are jobs to be done in the public sector, then I think that you wouldn't have to do much calculus to see that if you put a greater amount of money in welfare recipients for 5 years and they were no longer recipients and then their children had the advantage of parents or parent who worked and had the wherewithal to raise——

Mr. **DONNELLY**. What about welfare dependency? Does it exist? If it does, what are its causes?

Ms. **NORTON**. Well, it exists for many because there is no alternative to welfare dependency. If in fact as you heard testimony today, you ask for job training and you can't get it, and if the private sector is not producing jobs, then of course you are forced into welfare dependency. There is no question that there exists a welfare dependency syndrome. What I believe is the myth is that welfare is a voluntary condition. It is rather, a position that you are forced into. I don't think anybody would voluntarily go through what you have to go through to get welfare. It is a dehumanizing, degrading system. It doesn't seem to try to be anything else. It seems to be organized in order to discourage people from taking up the benefits. You have to be desperate to go through the hurdles and hop over the barriers put in the way of those who must get welfare assistance.

Mr. **DONNELLY**. There also seems to be a prevalent opinion I think in middle-class America—that welfare is passed on through generations now. Is that true? Have there been studies done on that, that children of AFDC parents in greater numbers end up on AFDC themselves?

Ms. **NORTON**. Well, to the extent that welfare mothers are not trained for work, you are going to have some—and you do see second and third generation welfare families. It begins, of course, with people coming to the North in the second great wave, the wave after World War II when there were not as many unskilled jobs and when a man couldn't get welfare if he remained in the house. This began the process of literally creating by the Government out of whole cloth the female-headed black family.

Structural unemployment, if anything, of course, has grown more and more in the black community. There are whole communities in the hardcore areas of minority communities where there are women raising children alone and you will go a long way before you will find a husband-wife family.

Of course, if children are raised in that environment it would be inevitable that there would be generational poverty and generational welfare existence. We can't afford to let it go on much longer.

Mr. **DONNELLY**. The key point is the cost-effectiveness question, I believe. I think Congress has dealt at least in the last few years with rising costs in Government programs by simply cutting them across the board, they call them tidying up eligibility requirements, basically just lopping people off. You really never get to the core problem and we are continuing to fund these programs with tremendous amounts of dollars, and Ms. Fiedler made mention of that, and it doesn't get to the root of the problem.

We continue to fund a system that frankly doesn't work. I wish we could call a panel of absolute success stories from the AFDC program.

Ms. **NORTON**. There are many.

Mr. **DONNELLY**. There are many, but in many cases in spite of—let me say in most cases in spite of the AFDC program.

Ms. **NORTON**. Almost always.

Mr. **Donnelly**. These four women that testified this morning, who are picking up the pieces of their lives through their own efforts. I won't pat the Government on the back for their successes. I would pat them on the back for their successes. Ms. Ferraro.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am an Eleanor Holmes Norton fan, and sitting here listening to your testimony, you know the Government has lost so much without your being part of the Government. I couldn't say part of this administration, but I must say that I think of what is going on at EEOC and think back 3 years and say those were the good old days for women and minorities in this country when you were there. And hopefully someday we will have a person of your caliber in that agency once again.

I want to first of all thank you for your testimony. I have lots of questions. Going through the idea of graduating out of AFDC, which I think is really the direction we have to go, we have to move people off the program. We have to do it by training. But when you talk about training you are also talking about day care and you are talking about transportation costs and about clothing that is more so people can go to work and look decent and participate.

My initial question is, What is the difference between combining a training program to AFDC? What is the difference between that and workfare?

Ms. **Norton**. I think it is an awfully good question. Workfare is the kind of program that gives self-sufficiency a bad name. It makes people think they ought not do it. As I understand it, workfare has you work off the grant.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Yes.

Ms. **Norton**. Congresswoman Ferraro, when I was human rights commissioner of New York there was a program that started out as workfare which may educate us as to how one can convert that negative concept into a positive one. Emanating, I guess, originally from the Federal Government, the State took up the notion of having people work off their grants. But the State of New York added money to it. They added to it time cards you signed in when you came in and it made a job out of these—what originated as workfare. They didn't add a lot to it and the people were not earning what they would earn on the regular job. New York didn't add so much that you always had 40 hours of work a week, but you had more than the workfare. And they added some of the benefits to it. It didn't cost a lot, but it certainly cost more than the old welfare program did.

When the program came into existence in the early 1970's there was hooting and hollering about it because it was workfare, and everybody hated it. At the time of the New York collapse, at the time of the collapse of the budget and the oncoming of the budget problems in New York, many programs were cut off. One of the first to be cut was this—after all, it was an add on to a Federal program. I have never seen a response like the response that came from the black and Puerto Rican communities in New York. There was wholesale outrage that the program was taken away.

The welfare recipients had become attached to jobs, in effect, because New York State had had the foresight to understand that they could with a little bit of extra money make workfare into a job instead of a punitive program.

I don't know of any study that has ever been made of the New York experience, but I think it would be wonderful to know more about how a program, with some innovation by the State, was converted from a negative workfare program to a positive work program. If we can get to where we make programs, jobs, instead of workfare, I think you will find many more takers than we have now.

Ms. **Ferraro**. You also mentioned the fact that so many of these young mothers on welfare have not completed their education. We have heard people testify this morning they have a ninth grade education, for example. In the policy statement there is a chapter on education. Do you see that as an additional piece to the welfare system? Is additional education, again with the day care element attached to it, is that another direction we can go to get those women off welfare?

Ms. **Norton**. Yes. First of all, I think many would not get on welfare at all if they had been able to finish high school. So it seems to me that there must be a concerted effort to keep the pregnant girl in school and bring the mother back to school. But you will have to show her. Should she want to come back, there is no place to keep the child, and she is stigmatized, so she almost always drops out. First to prevent dropping out.

Second, if there is a dropout from school, then after the woman goes on welfare the first thing, it seems to me, we ought to be doing is make it possible for her to finish high school. That seems to me, even if we didn't have a formal training program, that would go a long distance. We have women who have not only not finished school, but we have many recipients today who are the victims of the educational system that we are now only throwing over, the one that gave people a diploma with a 12th grade education when they read at the 4th grade level.

The Rockefeller program is finding a lot of that. So you will find disadvantaged people in training programs and you will have to figure out what jobs they can be trained for in the short run. Someone who is disadvantaged such that she reads on the fourth grade level, you may not be able to get a high school certificate for her, but there may be many jobs for which such a person could be trained.

Very special attention will have to be given to that, or we risk the old shibboleth of training people and yet there are no jobs out there. That is why I fervently ask that we don't simply presume that the private sector will be able to absorb all of the women or even most of the women on welfare, because I think they are the most disadvantaged people in our society and that even if part of the money is provided through the public sector, society comes out ahead; not only because we pay less but because their children will be better off and they will pass on less disadvantage and there will be fewer social problems coming out of their poverty and disadvantage.

Ms. **Ferraro**. You also, I see, I read your particular portion of this green booklet, and I found it very, very enlightening and your expounding on it this morning was very, very good. The statement in your article, "The Present Black Family Crisis," characterized chiefly by the precipitous growth of poor female head of households, can be traced almost directly to American racism—and you list some of those forces like slavery, discrimination, segregation. You add "racially hostile governmental and societal policies, practices and attitudes." Would you please outline some of the specific governmental and societal policies to which you refer?

Ms. NORTON. Chief among them would be the policy that forced the man out of the home in order for the family to survive. Black men have been subject to much longer periods of unemployment than whites, and have been subject to discrimination when they got jobs. So the typical family living in an industrial community will often have—particularly with the last hired, first fired—the problem of being out of work sooner or later. That is not unusual for the poorly educated black males who migrated from the South.

The welfare system said as long as you are in the home, even though you are on layoff and can't get another job, there won't be any money for food for your wife and children. That was the most debilitating policy. Then there was the whole round of discriminatory policies that kept black people out of jobs in both the Government and the private sector until the 1964 Act was passed, and a problem we are still working on, but at least we have legislation for that, was a large factor.

Ms. FERRARO. Do you see policies as having changed or gotten better or worse over the past several years?

Ms. NORTON. In some States the welfare policies are better. So far as I understand, this varies from State to State, whether or not a man, for example, can be in the house and the family stay together. The very notion that we are doing this in any State is remarkable given the price we have already paid.

Ms. FERRARO. Would you comment on the budget cuts as they exist now, on how they have over the past 2 years affected the situation that existed for the people on welfare and whether or not the direction you like to see is occurring, which is helping people get off welfare, and it is what the recipients want as well, which I also would like to see, whether that has been thwarted or exacerbated with the present cuts?

Ms. NORTON. Congresswoman Ferraro, I really wonder whether it is possible to convey what has happened to black and Hispanic ghettos across this country in the last 3 or 4 years. I wonder if I can rise to the occasion. We know that ghettos are bad and conditions are awful and of course there was some focus on them in the 1960's and 1970's, and badly as we felt about them we could say we were trying to do something. We had somebody in the Government working on a program here and there and not everybody is going down the drain. But I must say I find it difficult to convey the devastation that attends these communities and wonder what price we will have to pay with no attention to these communities.

If we were a strong and viable economy that was committed to rehabilitating the poorest of our communities, we would still lose many people because we couldn't do it fast enough. I shudder to think what is happening today in these communities.

I can understand the forces that brought about the cuts. I think they might even have been accepted in some measure in the minority communities if, for example, people had seen some evidence that we were building a new way, a more cost effective way, a different way, a better way.

But instead what they see is that there is going to be no way and that is as far as it appears, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, is if these communities were wiped off the face of the Earth it wouldn't make any difference—because after all this is "Government on the people's backs" or some such crazy slogan. So I am absolutely devastated by the lack of attention to what is a state of deterioration that in many instances is simply unmentionable.

It is one thing to be poor. It is another thing for the sense of hope to have deteriorated to the point where we have this terrible spread of violence, including terrible child abuse, the spread of hopelessness, the notion that there is no way out this time. If there was a Government program, and there were 1,000 people in the community and two got it, then you wanted to be one of those two; but if there is nothing and if you have had the bad fortune to be born in a ghetto part of a large city through no fault of your own, then "that is just too damn bad." And many, many people in the minority communities in America feel that way in the midst of a country that seems to have simply dropped its commitment in the gutter and said, that is it, and has done this abruptly and quickly and without explanation as far as they are concerned.

At some point we are going to wake up and I think the great tragedy will be that we will find that much that we have accomplished in the prior 20 years was retracted because we had an interregnum of heartless cruelty for which I believe we all shall pay.

Ms. **Ferraro**. I agree. My feeling is we will wake up and the great tragedy is that we may have lost another whole generation of kids who missed out on whether it was nutritional programs when their mothers were pregnant, educational programs when they were little, and training programs as they got older to put them in the work force so that they can help themselves. I am afraid we will just find we have lost a whole group of kids.

I must tell you that I again want to thank you for your testimony. It has been absolutely superb. I would appreciate if you would, when the foundation completes its study, if you would share that Rockefeller Foundation study with us. So we would then have your concepts and the foundation's concepts of what the system should be like and hopefully perhaps get through some legislative remedies to deal with the problems.

Again, thank you so much for your testimony.

Ms. **Norton**. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Professor, there is really nothing I can add to that magnificent statement you made in response to Ms. Ferraro's last question. But I just have a strong feeling that if the American people understood, one, the damage being done; two, the hopelessness that people feel out there, and the effect on children that is taking place because of these cut programs, and programs not well run, that they would demand we do something about it.

There is a tremendous amount of responsibility laid on public figures because of the rhetoric that is used on the poorest people and disadvantaged people and deprived people, the rhetoric that brings up the worst feeling in the electorate, it is just an absolute outrage. I think if they knew exactly what needed to be done and the punishment paid by children, they would be outraged. They would go to the Congress and say, you have got to do something about it. There is a terrible misconception out there and it is a misconception that has been—that a lot of responsibility should be placed on a lot of people, but a tremendous amount of that responsibility is on the elected officials in this Nation.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would say one more word. Even though Representatives like both of you are handicapped by the atmosphere and in perhaps being able to produce out of magic a whole new program, I would urge upon you that it might be possible for Congress to recommend and fund a model program that might exist in a few communities, even a half dozen communities, to test out new approaches so that at some point we might have an instrument, an example with which to convince people that there is a better way.

So even if you cannot do the impossible—and you both have been virtually trying to do that and I must tell you how much those of us out here on the outside, as I like to call it, appreciate that and understand it and know about it—even if you are not able out of very important hearings like this to create a new conception of welfare you may be able to convince your colleagues that at least they owe sufficient funds to start a model program, and there may be those on the right and left who could support this.

Nobody likes poverty. You may be able to get a consensus to at least try out new approaches which in themselves don't cost much because they would be simply model approaches.

Mr. DONNELLY. In terms of arguing the case in respects to fiscal responsibility, it doesn't make sense to keep throwing more billions of dollars down the same old sinkhole when every study shows that it is not doing any good.

Ms. NORTON. That much seems clear.

Mr. DONNELLY. There is a potential coalition of people out there from the left and right maybe coming to the same point for different reasons, but maybe Ms. Ferraro can put that coalition together.

Thank you.

Ms. NORTON. She is good at that.

Mr. DONNELLY. Again, thank you.

Our last two witnesses this morning are Dr. Harriet McAdoo from Howard University—I think I said Catholic University this morning—and Barbara Blum, president of the Manpower Research Demonstration Corp., in the great city of New York. Thank you very much for coming this morning. Thank you for your patience and please proceed.

STATEMENT OF HARRIETTE McADOO, Ph. D., PROFESSOR, RESEARCH SEQUENCE, SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK, HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Ms. MCADOO. Congressman Donnelly and members of the task force, I would like to take this opportunity to share with you some of the results of a large study[1] I have been conducting on single mothers of young children.

These results, I feel, may be of particular value to your task force as you deliberate on the impact of social policies upon the lives of women and children who are living alone in households across our country.

The women in this study should be of specific interest to you. These are women who are parenting alone, often, not so much as by choice, but because they have faced certain traumatic events in their lives that have left them alone: dissolution of their marriages; out-of-wedlock pregnancies; extended absences of fathers who are imprisoned; and, for a small number, widowhood. These women represent the majority of women who are parenting alone. They were not dependent upon welfare, but were employed outside of their homes and are maintaining their family units independent of governmental transfer payments.

Many are the working poor. These women may be considered the "survivors" of difficult life circumstances. These are the women who have been forced to develop coping strategies for very stressful life events.

The specific information that I will share with you will be related to one, these families' financial security; two, the levels of stress faced by the women; three, their involvement in family support networks; four, the women's feelings of self-worth; and five, the apparent impact that recent policy decisions have had upon mothers and their children.

CHANGING FAMILY STRUCTURES

It has been well documented that family structures are undergoing changes and are leaving more women and children in vulnerable family situations. The phenomena of women raising their children without a spouse and who are employed in the labor market, has been an increasing trend within all American families, and especially within black families. The single mother and child units are increasingly becoming the modal pattern in black communities, especially among younger women and among those who are in low-income families. We know that over 50 percent of all black children are now in these families. The increase in divorce has been the main contributor. The black divorce rate, of 265 per 1,000, has been found to be twice as high as the rate within white families. This has been a drastic increase from 1970, when the rate was only 104 per 1,000. The white rate during this period increased from 56 to 128 per 1,000 women.

The second contributor to the increases in female householders has been the increase in out-of-wedlock births. Now more than one-half of births to black women have been prior to or outside of marriage.

The major consequence of these demographic changes has been the financial stress under which these women and their children have been placed. These women have become increasingly vulnerable because of the feminization of poverty for people of color. Seventy percent of all poor black families in 1981 were female householders. Single women are poor, even when they receive some form of child support or alimony. Even if they are employed, their poverty level is high.

---

[1] "Extended Family Support of Single Black Mothers," Harriette McAdoo, Principal Investigator, funded by the Department of Health & Human Services Public Health Service, National Institute of Mental Health, Grant 5 R01 MH32159, March 1983.

In 1981, the poverty level was established to be $7,250 for a family of three and $9,290 for a family of four. Poverty increased when there were more children. In 1981 the levels for single employed black women with one, two, and three children were 26 percent, 42 percent, and 57 percent, respectively (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1983).

Most women are able to maintain themselves independent of total Government support. When families have gone on welfare, it has been found that they stay for an average of 3 years. Only a small percentage maintain this dependency and develop into a permanent underclass that transcends generations. And unfortunately, many of these are single black mothers. The vast majority of women are the working poor, who with the help of their support networks, are able to maintain themselves.

This particular group is the focus of my recent research, for I feel that if we are able to document the coping strategies of this group, we may be in a better position to suggest policies that would be supportive for other women who are more dependent upon the Government for their survival. We will then be able to make suggestions for policies that will support their survival.

These changing family situations in and of themselves, are not pathological or nonfunctional. All single mother family units are not harmful, just as all two-parent households are not good, as shown by the increasing levels of violence and abuse in many of these families. The functionality of a family unit is the important element that should be the focus of your deliberations. I will attempt to describe some elements that these families have found to be supportive of their functionality when women are parenting without husbands in the home. Functionality is defined as the ability to meet the expressive and developmental needs of all family members. I will attempt to describe some elements that these families found to be supportive of their functionality.

CHARACTERISTICS OF WOMEN IN THE STUDY

In looking at our sample, the 318 women had the following characteristics. They were all black women from Baltimore who were employed, and who had full responsibility of their children aged from birth to high school. This is shown in table 1.

Half the women had been married before and half had given birth outside of marriage. Only one-fourth had been married at the time of their first pregnancy. Half had been 18 years or younger at that time.

It is interesting to note that while all of these women were themselves in one-parent homes, they did not grow up in single-parent homes. Seventy percent of them grew up in homes that had both parents present. Therefore, they were not replicating the reproductive patterns of their own mothers by maintaining this single status.

These findings are contrary to one of the prevailing negative stereotypes about black families in which single-parent status is seen as being transmitted across generations.

These women had finished high school and most of them had been able to get some training in secretarial, trade, or in college courses. The majority of the women were working in clerical or personnel positions, while some had semiskilled, unskilled or lesser professional jobs.

The median income was $11,900. Thirty-seven percent of the women were receiving some form of child support from the father of the children, but this support was often low and very irregular. Half the women received financial help from other persons, with the most regular help given by the grandparents and other relatives.

In terms of socioeconomic status, one-third were middle class, one-half were solid working class, and a few, 16 percent, were lower class. While the characteristics of this employed group of black women are less vulnerable than those cited in the national demographic picture of black women, they do represent a picture of some of the characteristics that may be needed for survival by a female householder with children.

LEVELS OF STRESS IN THEIR LIVES

One of the most obvious findings of this study was that the women were playing many, often conflicting, roles in their lives. They were full-time employees, parenting alone, and involved in giving, as well as receiving, help to persons in their support networks. These many roles led to high levels of tension and stress. They experienced intense, frequent, and ongoing stressful significant events. The women perceived that stress was ranked greatest in three areas of their lives: The highest rank was finances, then housing and stress related to work. All of these areas, you will notice, are related to the finances of the family.

When the stress levels of the women were compared across the demographic variables, few of the anticipated stress differences were found, see table 2. Stress levels were similar regardless of whether first, the mother had been married or not, or second, if she had been over or under age 18 at her first pregnancy. Stress levels were similar regardless of their marital status or religion. There was a definite nonsignificant trend for stresses to be felt as being higher for mothers with lower incomes.

The clearest differences in perceived stress were found based upon their household living patterns. It was clear that when the mothers and their children lived with their kin, usually the grandparents, that they had significantly lower levels of stress. These results illustrate the important linkages that exist between extended family presence and support when single mothers find themselves in precarious positions.

There were three clusters of extended family characteristics that were regressed against the mothers' perceived stress: family affection, kin proximity, and kin levels of interaction. Two characteristics that were found to be most predictive of lower levels of stress were: First, the mothers' satisfaction with her family, and the frequency of interaction between the mothers and their relatives.

The most important variables were found to be the mothers' feelings of satisfaction with their family situations, the ease with which the mothers could visit with their relatives, the number of kin upon whom they could depend to help them, and the frequency of talking with supportive kin. All of these factors were found to be most predictive of lower levels of perceived stress.

This assistance was especially crucial when the women were going through transitional crisis points in their lives: when their marriages were breaking up, immediately following divorce or final separations, and when a child was born out of wedlock. During these points, women were found to be most intimately involved with their families and levels of religiosity were significantly higher. The emotional support that was provided by the family and their religion were recorded as the most important elements in their lives during these periods.

Another very interesting finding was that when the mothers who had given birth outside of wedlock were compared to those who had been married on all of the mental health measures, no significant differences were found between the two groups. These measurements were self-esteem, acute and chronic anxiety, satisfaction with their lives, and mastery over their environments. This would indicate that, when mothers are provided support during their critical points, over time the mothers are able to develop positive feelings of self-worth and lower anxiety as they parent alone.

While the extended family support was most predictive of lower levels of stress, it should also be noted that the women were found to have more positive self-concepts when they were able to feel that they had some degree of mastery over their lives and their environment. The women felt better about themselves when they were not the passive recipients of help but when they were actively involved in meeting their own needs and those of their children. Their greatest concern was that they maintain financial independence.

There was one finding though that saddened all of us. This finding has a direct bearing to this task force. One year after we finished interviewing the women, we decided to try to find out what had happened to them during this period of changing policies. We were unable to do full-scale interviewing in person so were only able to contact them by telephone. However, we did find that almost one-third of the women were no longer employed. It appears that many of them had been directly impacted by the cuts in budgets that were related to job training, day care, and social services. Many of them had been laid off, others had found that even with a job that there was no affordable day care. Job training programs had been eliminated. Many had been forced to go on welfare.

Some of the stories that we heard were truly heart rending. This is particularly significant because these were women whom we had labeled as "survivors" only a year or so earlier. With increases in family poverty we could safely assume that even more of these women have now been forced out of the marketplace into welfare.

The swift changes in their status is clearly illustrative of the vulnerability of single mothers. Many had been latecomers to the marketplace. Even when they attempt to maintain mastery over their lives, by being self-supportive, and when they have strong family support, they are easy victims when supportive services are curtailed within their communities. Their own extended families were unable to maintain full support of these family units, for they too were undergoing severe economic depression.

As this task force continues its deliberations, I hope that it is able to gather more empirical evidence of the devastating impact that policies can have on female householders. It is crucial that we become more fully aware of how small changes in policy can have direct impact upon the lives of single women and their children.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Testimony resumes on p. 89.]

[The prepared statement of Dr. McAdoo follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. HARRIETTE MCADOO

LINKAGES BETWEEN SINGLE MOTHERS AND FAMILY DENSITY

Congressman Donnelly and members of the Task Force, I would like to take this opportunity to share with you some of the results of a large study[1] that I have been conducting on single mothers of school age, or younger, children. These results, I feel, may be of particular value to your Task Force on Entitlements, Uncontrollables, and Indexing, as you deliberate on the impact of social policies upon the lives of women and children who are living alone in households across our country.

The women in this study should be of specific interest to you. These are women who are parenting alone, not so much as by choice, but because they have faced certain traumatic events in their lives that have left them alone: dissolution of their marriages; out-of-wedlock pregnancies; extended absences of fathers who are imprisoned, and, for a small number, widowhood. These women represent the majority of women who are parenting alone. They were not dependent upon welfare, but were employed outside of their homes and are maintaining their family units independent of governmental transfer payments. Many were the working poor. These women may be considered the "survivors" of difficult life circumstances. These are the women who have been forced to develop coping strategies to stressful life events.

The specific information that I will share with you will be related to 1) these families' financial security, 2) the levels of stress faced by the women, 3) their involvement in family support networks, 4) the women's feelings of self worth, and 5) the apparent impact that recent policy decisions have had upon mothers and their children.

Changing Family Structures

It has been well documented that family structures are undergoing changes and are leaving more women and children in vulnerable family situations. The phenomena of women raising their children without a spouse and who are employed in the labor market, has been an increasing trend within all American families, and especially within Black families. The single mother and child units are increasingly becoming the modal pattern in Black communities, especially among younger women and among those who are in low income families. Over 50 percent of all Black children are now in these families. The increases in divorce has been the main contributor. The Black divorce rate, of 265 per 1,000, has been found to be twice as high as the rate within white families. This has been a drastic increase from 1970, when the rate was only 104 per 1,000. The white rate during this period increased from 56 to 128 per 1,000. The second contributor to the increases in female householders has been the increase in out-of-wedlock births. Now more than one-half of births to Black women have been prior to or outside of marriage.

---

[1] "Extended Family Support of Single Black Mothers," Harriette McAdoo, Principal Investigator, funded by the Department of Health & Human Services Public Health Service, National Institute of Mental Health, Grant 5 R01 MH32159, March 1983.

The major consequence of these demographic changes has been the financial stress under which these women and their children have been placed. These women have become increasingly vulnerable because of the feminization of poverty for people of color. Seventy percent of all poor Black families in 1981 were female householders. Single women are poor, even when they receive some form of child support or alimony. Even if they are employed, their poverty level is high. In 1981, the poverty level was established to be $7,250 for a family of three and $9,290 for a family of four. Poverty increased when there were more children. In 1981 the levels for single employed Black women with one, two, and three children were 26 percent, 42 percent, and 57 percent respectively (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1983). Most women are able to maintain themselves independent of total government support. When families have gone on welfare, it has been found that they stay for an average of three years. A small percentage maintain this dependency and develop into a permanent underclass that transcends generations. However, the vast majority of these women are the working poor who, with the help of their support networks, are able to maintain themselves. This group is the focus of my recent research, for I feel that if we are able to document the coping strategies of this group, we may be in a better position to suggest policies that would be supportive for other women who are more dependent upon the government for their survival.

These changing family structures in and of themselves, are not pathological or non-functional. All single mother family units are not harmful, just as all two-parent households are not good, as shown by the increasing levels of violence and abuse in many of these families. The functionality of a family unit, which can be defined as its ability to meet the expressive and instrumental developmental needs of all family members, and not its particular structure, is the important element that should be the focus of your deliberations. I will attempt to describe some elements that these families have found to be supportive of their functionality when women are parenting without husbands in the home.

Characteristics of Women in the Study

The 318 women in our study as a group had the following characteristics: they were all Black women from Baltimore who were employed and who had full responsibility for their children, aged from birth through high school (see Table 1). Half of the women had been married before and half had given birth outside of marriage. Only one-fourth had been married at the time of their first pregnancy and one-half had been 18 years or younger at that time. It is interesting to note that while all of these women were in one-parent homes, they did not grow up in single-parent homes. Seventy percent of them grew up in homes that had both parents present; therefore, they were not replicating reproductive patterns of their own mothers by maintaining their single status. These findings are contrary to one of the prevailing stereotypes about Black families in which this status is seen as being transmitted across generation

These women had finished high school and while only a few had finished college (19%) and gone on to get some graduate training (12%), most had been able to get some training in a trade or secretarial school, or in some college courses. The majority of the women were working in clerical or personnel positions (59%), while some had lesser professional jobs (25%), and a few had semi-skilled or unskilled jobs (17%).

The median income was $11,900. Thirty-seven percent of the women were receiving some form of child support from the father of the children, but this support was often low and irregular. One-half of the women received financial help from other persons, with the most regular help given by the grandparents and other relatives. In terms of socioeconomic status, one-third were middle class, one-half were solid working class, and a few (16%) were lower class. While the characteristics of this employed group of Black women are less vulnerable than those cited in the national demographic picture of Black women, they do present a picture of some of the characteristics that may be needed for survival by a female householder with children.

Levels of Stress in their Lives

One of the most obvious findings of this study was that the women were playing many, often conflicting, roles in their lives. They were full-time employees, parenting alone, and involved in giving, as well as receiving help to persons in their support networks. These many roles led to high levels of tension stress. They experienced intense, frequent, and ongoing stressful significant events in their lives. The women perceived that stress ranked greatest in three areas of their lives: finances, housing, and related to work. All of these areas are related to finances of the family.

When the stress levels of the women were compared across the demographic variables, few of the anticipated stress differences were found (see Table . Stress levels were similar regardless of whether the mother had been married or not, or if she had been over or under age 18 at her first pregnancy. Stress levels were similar regardless of their marital status or religion. There was a definite non-significant trend for stresses to be felt as being higher for mothers with lower incomes.

Extended Family Support

The clearest differences in perceived stress were found based upon their household living patterns. It was clear that when the mothers and their children lived with their kin, usually the grandparents, that they had significantly lower levels of stress. These results illustrate the important linkages that exist between extended family presence and support when single mothers find themselves in precarious positions.

There were three clusters of extended family characteristics that were regressed against the mothers' perceived stress: family affection, kin proximity, and kin levels of interaction (see Table 3). Two characteristics that were found to be most predictive of lower levels of stress were: 1) family affection, and 2) the frequency of interaction between the mothers and their relatives. The most important variables were found to be the mothers' feelings of a satisfaction with their family situations, the ease with which the mothers could visit with their relatives, the number of kin upon whom they could depend to help them, and the frequency of talking with supportive kin. All of these factors were found to be most predictive of lower levels of perceived stress in the families of these single women. This assistance was especially crucial when the women were going through transitional crisis points in their lives: when their marriages were breaking up and immediately following divorce or final separations, and when a child was born out-of-wedlock. During these points, women were found to be most intimately involved with their families and levels of religiosity were significantly higher. The emotional support that was provided by the family and their religion were the most important elements in their lives during these periods.

Another very interesting finding was that when the mothers who had given birth outside of wedlock were compared to those who had been married on all of the mental health measures, no significant differences were found. These measurements were self-esteem, acute and chronic anxiety, satisfaction with their lives, and mastery over their environments. This would indicate that, when mothers are provided support during their critical points, over time the mothers are able to develop positive feelings of self worth and lower anxiety.

While the extended family support was most predictive of lower levels of stress, it should also be noted that the women were found to have more positive self concepts when they were able to feel that they had some degree of mastery over their lives and their environment. The women felt better about themselves when they were not the passive recipients of help, but when they were actively involved in meeting their own needs and those of their children. Their greatest concern was that they maintain financial independence.

There was one finding though that saddened all of us. This finding has a direct bearing to this Task Force. One year after we finished interviewing the women we decided to try to find out what had happened to them during this period of changing policies. We were unable to do full-scale interviewing in person so were only able to contact them by telephone. However, we did find that almost one-third of the women were no longer employed. It appears that many of them had been directly impacted by the cuts in budgets that were related to job training, day care, and social services. Many of them had been laid off, others had found that even with a job that there was no affordable day care. Many had been forced to go on welfare. Some of the stories that we heard were truly heart rending. This is particularly significant because these were women whom we had labeled as "survivors" only a year or so earlier.

The swift changes in their status is clearly illustrative of the vulnerability of single mothers. Even whe they attempt to maintain mastery over their lives, by being self supportive, and when they have strong family support, they are easy victims when supportive services are curtailed within communities. Their own extended families were unable to maintain full support of these family units, for they too were undergoing severe economic depression. As this Task Force continues its deliberations, I hope that it is able to gather more empirical evidence of the devastating impact that policies can have on female householders. It is crucial that we become more fully aware of how small changes in policy can have direct impact upon the lives of single women and their children.

Table 1

Selected Background Characteristics of Single Mothers (N=318)

Variable	Total Percentage
Previous marital status	
Ever married	56
Never married	44
	100%
Marital Status	
Separated	26
Divorced	29
Widowed	2
Never	44
	101%
Married, 1st pregnancy	
Yes	27
No	73
	100%
Age, 1st pregnancy	
18 and under	46
19 and over	54
	100%
Present age	
Under 30	54
Over 30	46
	100%
Family structure	
Attenuated nuclear (mother-child)	66
Attenuated extended (mother, child/ren, relatives)	25
Augmented attenuated nuclear (mother, child, nonrel.)	7
Augmented attenuated extended (mother, child, relative, nonrelative)	2
	100%

Socioeconomic Status	Total Percentage
Income	
Less than 5,999	9
6,000- 8,999	16
9,000-11,999	24
12,000-14,999	19
15,000-17,999	12
18,000-23,999	
24,000 +	
	1 %
Education	
Grade School	
Junior High School	
High School/Trade School	37
1-2 yrs. college	29
3-4 yrs. college	19
Graduate/Professional	12
	100%
Occupation	
Executive/major, lesser professional	25
Administrative personnel	12
Owner of bus./clerical	47
Skilled/semi-skilled	14
Unskilled	3
	101%
Religion	
Baptist	[illegible]
Methodist	
Catholic	
Other Protestant	
No religion	
	%

Class		Hollingshead-Redlich	Modified	Self Rating
I	Upper	1	11	
II	Middle	27	20	4
III	Working	53	53	36
IV	Lower	17	15	45
V	Under	3	1	15
	Total	101	100	100
	N = 318			

Table 2

Means and Analysis of Variance of Perceived Stress by Demographic Variables

Demographic Variable	Group	Perceived Stress N	*M*	*SD*
Marital Status	Never married	130	39.21	13.90
	Separated	76	43.07	14.67
	Divorced	89	41.85	16.07
	Widowed	6	49.17	12.04
		301		
Household Structure	Mother & child	199	42.47	14.21[1/]
	Mother, child, kin	74	35.74	15.30
	Mother, child, nonkin	22	45.23	14.93
	Mother, child, kin, nonkin	6	37.67	16.54
		301		
Family Structure	Nuclear	200	42.41	14.20[2/]
	Extended	74	35.74	15.30
	Augmented	27	44.07	15.83
		301		
Age at 1st pregnancy	18 & younger	140	40.82	14.56
	19 & older	158	41.74	15.04
		298		
Married 1st pregnancy	Yes	77	42.39	15.05
	No	222	40.86	14.73
		299		
Religion	Baptist	146	40.69	15.83
	Methodist	56	40.89	13.58
	Catholic	42	39.62	12.83
	Other Protestant	46	43.87	14.74
	None	11	43.36	14.29
		301		
Income	$ 5,000 less	74	42.62	13.03
	6- 8,900	129	42.33	15.21
	9-11,900	67	39.51	15.61
	12-14,900	14	38.64	15.97
	15 +	11	32.18	14.13
		295		

[1/] F (3,297) = 3.32, $p < .01$

[2/] F (2,298) = 4.64, $p < .01$

Table 3

Regression Analysis of Family Patterns Predicting Perceived Stress

Predictor	*r*	R^2	Beta	*F*	(df)
Family Affection					
Satisfaction with family situation	.333***	.11	.31	1.32	,273)
Attitude toward family contact	.127	.12	.10	1.02	
Closeness of family members	.155	.13	.09	13.66**	
Attitude about family aid	-.014	.13	-.07	10.55**	
How much family help meant	.094	.14	.06	8.71*	
Kin Proximity					
Often see closest kin	.096	.01	.11	2.50	5,263)
Number of kin feel close to	-.052	.01	-.07	1.83	
Kinship propinquity of helpers	-.031	.01	-.03	1.29	
Geographic proximity (miles)	.034	.01	-.07	1.00	
Residential proximity	.060	.02	.06	0.90	
Kin Interaction					
Ease to visit kin	.314**	.10	.23	14.05**	(6,123)
Frequency talk with recip. kin	-.195*	.14	-.25	10.15**	
Number kin count on to help	.260**	.18	.23	9.47**	
Obligation to kin	-.067	.19	-.07	7.23**	
Kinship propinquity-recip.	.047	.19	.05	5.83*	
Ease kin to visit R	.193*	.19	.02	4.83*	

N=130

* < *p* .05
** < *p* .01
*** < *p* .001

References

McAdoo, H. "Patterns of Upward Mobility in Black Families." Chapter in Black Families, H. McAdoo (Ed.) Beverly Hills, CA., Sage Publications, 1981.

McAdoo, H. Extended Family Support of Single Black Mothers, Final Report, Department of Health & Human Services, Public Health Service, NIMH, Grant 5 R01 MH32159, March 1983.

Pearce, D. & McAdoo, H. Women and Children: Alone and in Poverty, published by the National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C., September 1981.

Reid, J. Black America in the 1980s. Population Bulletin, Vol 37, No. 4, December 1982, ISSN 0032-468X.

U.S. Civil Rights Commission. Disadvantaged Women and their Children, 1983.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. America's Black Population: 1970 to 1982; A Statistical View, Special Publication PIO/POP-83-1, July 1983.

Mr. DONNELLY. Thank you, Dr. McAdoo. Dr. Blum.

STATEMENT OF BARBARA B. BLUM, PRESIDENT, MANPOWER RESEARCH DEMONSTRATION CORP., NEW YORK, N.Y.

Ms. BLUM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is a privilege to be here today to assist in your consideration of the status of women and children in this country. As a welfare administrator, I spent a great deal of time and energy struggling to understand how the programs designed to assist women and children could be structured and administered to do so more effectively.

In the child welfare, food stamp, income maintenance, and medical assistance programs administered by the New York State Department of Social Services and other similar agencies throughout the country there is much of value that should be preserved. Essential services and support are provided which allow children and families to be maintained and, sometimes, to progress.

But these programs are also full of inconsistencies and contradictions that frustrate administrators and clients alike. The AFDC program is, perhaps, the most important and one of the most frustrating, for it has provided few options for the women and children it serves.

Essentially, the problem is that the AFDC program did not keep pace with changing conditions. Today I want to summarize some preceptions developed on the basis of past experience in New York State and from my current responsibilities as president of a nonprofit organization devoted to testing programs which are designed to prepare disadvantaged persons for the work force.

First, let me stress how engrossed the welfare system had become in the 1970's in the process. We separated the functions of services and income maintenance. We attacked the growing error rates both administrative and client-created. We developed massive computer systems to gain control of these complicated programs with income disregards, such as the thirty and one-third provision, and eligibility measurements often not consistent among programs. Most, if not all, of these activities were initiated to counter the exceptional growth in AFDC during the 1960's.

Even in that period of expansion, however, clients requiring assistance seldom had available the services and programs which could lead to more independent living conditions. Indeed, it has been our tendency to assume that the conditions and needs of welfare clients are similar.

The recent work of researchers Bane and Ellwood is cause for more rigorous thinking, and a change in our practices. In their recent analyses of the length of time AFDC recipients spend on welfare, they point to the dual nature of the AFDC program, the provision of short-term relief contrasted to long-term income maintenance, and the importance of identifying groups of recipients likely to be in one category or the other.

Their study concludes that policies designed to help mothers work may have been too narrowly targeted, that women with young children, for example, are not less likely to earn their way off welfare than other mothers.

In addition, some mothers may be able to move off welfare quickly while others will need more intensive forms of employment aid. Employment programs must take these diverse dynamics into account.

This analysis suggests three possible and different strategies for increasing the economic self-sufficiency of AFDC women—and in so doing their children. MDRC's research has indicated that each of the strategies can be effective.

First, let us consider the needs of the adolescent parent—a group that has only recently emerged as a national priority. For these young women and their children, the value of approaches which go beyond traditional program boundaries is especially clear.

The relationship of teenage pregnancy to dependency provides the starting point for consideration of this issue.

We know that a disproportionate number of women on welfare are either now teen mothers or began their association with welfare as teen mothers. Of all the women in AFDC households in 1975, 61 percent gave birth to a baby before the age of 20. A 1982 study estimates that with the continuation of present trends, women aged 20 to 29 will receive $47.5 billion in AFDC, medicaid, and food stamps payments between 1981 and 1990. Of that total, $39.6 billion, more than four-fifths, will go to women whose first births occurred when they were under 20.

Upon reflection, it is not surprising that the teen mother is such a likely candidate for welfare. Consider the following:

Research on high school dropouts shows a strong correlation between pregnancy and the cessation of education.

Women who first gave birth as teens have larger families than those who postpone child bearing.

Educational level and family size are important determinants of a women's decision to enter the labor force.

Furthermore, evidence suggests that the teenage mother is likely to be a long-term welfare recipient.

Research has shown that for this group, a multiservice approach focused on completion of high school and preparation for employment, can offer promise for the mother and her child. MDRC's Project Redirection has enrolled some 900 pregnant and parenting teenagers since 1981. Most of the participants have been welfare eligibles. The program is designed to motivate the teen to use a broad range of services—educational and employability services, family planning and health care. A key premise of the program is that many of these services are already available in the community. The function of redirection is to assist teens to find and use them effectively.

MDRC's research has shown that this model is a workable one. A year after enrollment participants were receiving many more services than a comparison group, significantly more were in school or had graduated and 30 percent more had held jobs than comparison teens. The youngsters who dropped out of school had the largest impacts at this point 1 year after the program began.

Project Redirection offers some clear direction for our efforts to plan early intervention for AFDC young women and their families. The challenge now is to adapt this promising model for use in the public sector.

As another example, there is the long-term AFDC recipient who may seem the least likely candidate for successful intervention. MDRC's research and a program called "supported work," shows impressive impacts for this group. The supported work program provided a structured work experience for four groups of individuals with severe employment difficulties. Participants were offered a job for a limited period of time under conditions of close supervision. After extensive evaluation, supported work was found to be an effective method for helping women who were long-term recipients of welfare enter the labor market while at the same time reducing welfare costs.

Findings show that AFDC women who participated in the program performed better than those who did not in terms of increased employment, increased earnings, and reduced welfare dependence. The significance of these differences held up consistently throughout the postprogram period. It is also of interest that many of the women in the AFDC group sought and obtained jobs and remained employed even though their earnings were substantially offset by the loss of welfare benefits.

In addition, the cost/benefit analysis for the AFDC group revealed that the program yielded considerable net benefit to society because of the earnings gains, the value of the work performed and the reduction in benefits received.

For another and final group of welfare clients, those who have been on the caseload for relatively short periods of time, there is a growing body of evidence that carefully constructed individual or group job search programs should be encouraged.

Job search programs for AFDC recipients have been examined through research and experimental WIN programs. This research has shown that group and individual job search strategies are feasible to operate and can be integrated into regular activities of the WIN program or other employment and training programs. Job search results in modest but significant employment and earning gains for participants. It can be an effective approach for individuals who do not have substantial barriers to participation in the labor force.

MDRV will be learning more about this approach and the effectiveness of community work experience programs through a multistate demonstration of State work welfare initiatives which is now underway.

From the collective experience of program operators and those who analyze program results, we know a great deal about programs that do make a difference. The challenge now is to use this knowledge to create a more responsive AFDC program.

Thank you.

[Testimony resumes on p. 101.]

[The prepared statement of Ms. Blum follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BARBARA B. BLUM

IT IS A PRIVILEGE TO APPEAR BEFORE THE HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE TO ASSIST IN YOUR CONSIDERATION OF THE STATUS OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN THIS COUNTRY. AS A WELFARE ADMINISTRATOR, I SPENT A GREAT DEAL OF TIME AND ENERGY STRUGGLING TO UNDERSTAND HOW THE PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO ASSIST WOMEN AND CHILDREN COULD BE STRUCTURED AND ADMINISTERED TO DO SO MORE EFFECTIVELY. IN THE CHILD WELFARE, FOOD STAMP, INCOME MAINTENANCE AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES AND OTHER SIMILAR AGENCIES THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY THERE IS MUCH OF VALUE THAT SHOULD BE PRESERVED. ESSENTIAL SERVICES AND SUPPORT ARE PROVIDED WHICH ALLOW CHILDREN AND FAMILIES TO BE MAINTAINED AND, SOMETIMES, TO PROGRESS.

BUT THESE PROGRAMS ARE ALSO FULL OF INCONSISTENCIES AND CONTRADICTIONS THAT FRUSTRATE ADMINISTRATORS AND CLIENTS ALIKE. THE AFDC PROGRAM IS, PERHAPS, THE MOST IMPORTANT AND ONE OF THE MOST FRUSTRATING, FOR IT HAS PROVIDED FEW OPTIONS FOR THE WOMEN AND CHILDREN IT SERVES.

IN MY CURRENT POSITION AS PRESIDENT OF THE MANPOWER DEMONSTRATION RESEARCH CORPORATION - WHICH IS DEDICATED TO EXPLORING PROGRAMS TO INCREASE THE SELF-SUFFICIENCY

OF DISADVANTAGED PEOPLE - I HAVE HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO CONFIRM MY IMPRESSIONS AND PERCEPTIONS AS AN ADMINISTRATOR. PROGRAMS CAN BE DEVELOPED TO PROMOTE THE SELF-SUFFICIENCY OF WELFARE RECIPIENTS IF THEY ARE CAREFULLY DESIGNED AND TARGETED. TO DO SO, HOWEVER, WE MUST FIRST RECOGNIZE THE DIVERSITY OF THE POPULATION WE HOPE TO SERVE.

IT HAS BEEN OUR TENDENCY TO ASSUME THAT THE CONDITIONS AND NEEDS OF WELFARE CLIENTS ARE SIMILAR. WE ARE FORTUNATE THAT THE WORK OF RESEARCHERS SUCH AS BANE AND ELLWOOD IS CAUSE FOR MORE RIGOROUS THINKING, AND A CHANGE IN OUR PRACTICES. IN THEIR RECENT ANALYSES OF THE LENGTH OF TIME AFDC RECIPIENTS SPEND ON WELFARE, THEY POINT TO THE DUAL NATURE OF THE AFDC PROGRAM, SHORT-TERM RELIEF AND LONG-TERM INCOME MAINTENANCE, AND THE IMPORTANCE OF IDENTIFYING GROUPS OF RECIPIENTS LIKELY TO BE IN ONE CATEGORY OR THE OTHER. THEIR STUDY CONCLUDES THAT POLICIES DESIGNED TO HELP MOTHERS WORK MAY HAVE BEEN TOO NARROWLY TARGETED, THAT WOMEN WITH YOUNG CHILDREN, FOR EXAMPLE, ARE NOT LESS LIKELY TO EARN THEIR WAY OFF WELFARE THAN OTHER MOTHERS. IN ADDITION, SOME MOTHERS MAY BE ABLE TO MOVE OFF WELFARE QUICKLY WHILE OTHERS WILL NEED MORE INTENSIVE FORMS OF EMPLOYMENT AID. EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS MUST TAKE THESE

DIVERSE DYNAMICS INTO ACCOUNT.

THIS ANALYSIS SUGGESTS THREE POSSIBLE AND DIFFERENT STRATEGIES FOR INCREASING THE ECONOMIC SELF SUFFICIENCY OF AFDC WOMEN - AND IN SO DOING THEIR CHILDREN. MDRC'S RESEARCH HAS INDICATED THAT EACH OF THE STRATEGIES CAN BE EFFECTIVE.

FIRST, LET US CONSIDER THE NEEDS OF THE ADOLESCENT PARENT - A GROUP THAT HAS ONLY RECENTLY EMERGED AS A NATIONAL PRIORITY. FOR THESE YOUNG WOMEN AND THEIR CHILDREN, THE VALUE OF APPROACHES WHICH GO BEYOND TRADITIONAL PROGRAM BOUNDARIES IS ESPECIALLY CLEAR.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF TEENAGE PREGNANCY TO DEPENDENCY PROVIDES THE STARTING POINT FOR CONSIDERATION OF THIS ISSUE.

WE KNOW THAT A DISPROPORTIONATE NUMBER OF WOMEN ON WELFARE ARE EITHER NOW TEEN MOTHERS OR BEGAN THEIR ASSOCIATION WITH WELFARE AS TEEN MOTHERS. OF ALL THE WOMEN IN AFDC HOUSEHOLDS IN 1975, 61 PERCENT GAVE BIRTH TO A BABY BEFORE THE AGE OF 20. A 1982 STUDY ESTIMATES THAT WITH THE CONTINUATION OF PRESENT TRENDS, WOMEN AGED 20-29 WILL RECEIVE $47.5 BILLION IN AFDC, MEDICAID AND FOOD STAMPS PAYMENTS BETWEEN 1981 AND 1990. OF THAT TOTAL, $39.6 BILLION WILL GO TO WOMEN WHOSE FIRST BIRTHS OCCURRED WHEN THEY WERE UNDER 20.

UPON REFLECTION, IT IS NOT SURPRISING THAT THE TEEN MOTHER IS SUCH A LIKELY CANDIDATE FOR WELFARE. CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING:

- RESEARCH ON HIGH SCHOOL DROP-OUTS SHOWS A STRONG CORRELATION BETWEEN PREGNANCY AND THE CESSATION OF EDUCATION, WITH ABOUT ONE-HALF TO TWO-THIRDS OF ALL GIRLS WHO DROP OUT OF SCHOOL CLAIMING TO HAVE DONE SO BECAUSE OF PREGNANCY OR MARRIAGE.

- WOMEN WHO FIRST GAVE BIRTH AS TEENS HAVE LARGER FAMILIES THAN THOSE WHO POSTPONE CHILD-BEARING, AND THE EARLIER THE AGE AT FIRST BIRTH, THE GREATER THE DISPARITY.

- EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND FAMILY SIZE ARE IMPORTANT DETERMINANTS OF A WOMAN'S DECISION TO ENTER THE LABOR FORCE. BECAUSE EARLY CHILDBEARING HAS SHORTENED THEIR SCHOOLING, MANY ADOLESCENT PARENTS ARE LEFT WITHOUT

THE SKILLS OR QUALIFICATIONS WHICH CREATE EMPLOYMENT MOBILITY.

FURTHERMORE, EVIDENCE SUGGESTS THAT THE TEENAGE MOTHER IS LIKELY TO BE A LONG-TERM WELFARE RECIPIENT. THE BANE AND ELLWOOD STUDY REVEALED THAT THERE ARE DRAMATIC DIFFERENCES IN THE LENGTH OF TIME SPENT ON WELFARE. AND WHILE AGE ALONE IS NOT THE CRUCIAL FACTOR IN DETERMINING THE DURATION OF WELFARE RECEIPT, IT WAS FOUND THAT THE CONSTELLATION OF CHARACTERISTICS ASSOCIATED WITH TEEN PREGNANCY -- FOR EXAMPLE, BEING A MOTHER OF MANY CHILDREN, A HIGH SCHOOL DROP-OUT, OR NON-WHITE -- DOES PREDICT LONGER PERIODS OF DEPENDENCY.

RESEARCH HAS SHOWN THAT FOR THIS GROUP, A MULTI SERVICE APPROACH FOCUSED ON COMPLETION OF HIGH SCHOOL AND PREPARATION FOR EMPLOYMENT, CAN OFFER PROMISE FOR THE MOTHER AND HER CHILD. MDRC'S PROJECT REDIRECTION HAS ENROLLED SOME 900 PREGNANT AND PARENTING TEENAGERS SINCE 1983 IN FOUR SITES LOCATED IN COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS. MOST OF THE PARTICIPANTS HAVE BEEN WELFARE ELIGIBLES. THE PROGRAM IS DESIGNED TO MOTIVATE THE TEEN TO USE A BROAD RANGE OF SERVICES -- EDUCATIONAL AND EMPLOYABILITY SERVICES, FAMILY PLANNING AND HEALTH CARE. A KEY PREMISE OF THE PROGRAM IS THAT MANY OF

THESE SERVICES ARE ALREADY AVAILABLE IN THE COMMUNITY. THE FUNCTION OF REDIRECTION IS TO ASSIST TEENS TO FIND AND USE THEM EFFECTIVELY.

PROJECT REDIRECTION ATTEMPTS TO MOTIVATE TEENS TO VIEW SERVICES NOT JUST AS ISOLATED ACTIVITIES, BUT IN TERMS OF A PLAN FOR FUTURE SELF-SUFFICIENCY. TO HELP THEM GAIN PERSPECTIVE, THE PROGRAM USES AN INNOVATIVE STRATEGY, PIONEERED IN BROOKLYN BY THE SISTERHOOD OF BLACK SINGLE MOTHERS. WHEN SHE ENTERS THE PROGRAM, EACH TEEN IS ASSIGNED TO A COMMUNITY WOMEN, AN OLDER VOLUNTEER WHO ACTS AS A ROLE MODEL TO HER, AND WHO HELPS HER LCOATE AND USE THE SERVICES -- ASSISTING HER, FOR EXAMPLE, TO REGISTER FOR SCHOOL, MEET CLINIC APPOINTMENTS OR ARRANGE FOR CHILD CARE WHILE SHE ATTENDS CLASSES.

THE COMMUNITY WOMAN, ALONG WITH A REDIRECTION STAFF MEMBER, ALSO HELPS THE TEEN FORMULATE AND PERIODICALLY UPDATE AN INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPANT PLAN, A DOCUMENT THAT SPECIFIES THE TEEN'S LONG-RANGE GOALS AND THE SERVICES SHE INTENDS TO USE TO ATTAIN THEM.

MDRC'S RESEARCH HAS SHOWN THAT THE REDIRECTION PROGRAM MODEL IS A WORKABLE AND A FEASIBLE ONE. A YEAR AFTER ENROLLMENT PARTICIPANTS WERE RECEIVING MANY MORE SERVICES THAN A COMPARISON GROUP, SIGNIFICANTLY MORE

WERE IN SCHOOL OR HAD GRADUATED AND 30 PERCENT MORE HAD HELD JOBS THAN COMPARISON TEENS.

WITH THESE POSITIVE FINDINGS, PROJECT REDIRECTION IS BEING IMPLEMENTED IN SEVEN NEW SITES ACROSS THE COUNTRY. THIS SECOND STAGE OF THE DEMONSTRATION WILL ALLOW US TO EXAMINE HOW THE PROGRAM MODEL WORKS IN A VARIETY OF SETTINGS - ESPECIALLY SCHOOLS.

PROJECT REDIRECTION OFFERS SOME CLEAR DIRECTION IN OUR EFFORTS TO PLAN EARLY INTERVENTION FOR THESE YOUNG WOMEN AND THEIR FAMILIES. THE CHALLENGE IS NOW TO ADAPT THIS PROMISING MODEL FOR USE IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR.

SECOND, LET US CONSIDER THE LONG-TERM AFDC RECIPIENT WHO MAY SEEM THE LEAST LIKELY CANDIDATE FOR SUCCESSFUL INTERVENTION. MDRC'S RESEARCH ON THE SUPPORTED WORK PROGRAM SHOWED IMPRESSIVE IMPACTS FOR THIS GROUP.

ORIGINALLY TESTED THROUGH A MULTI-SITE, FIVE YEAR NATIONAL DEMONSTRATION, THE SUPPORTED WORK PROGRAM PROVIDED A STRUCTURED WORK EXPERIENCE FOR FOUR GROUPS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH SEVERE EMPLOYMENT DIFFICULTIES INCLUDING WOMEN WHO HAD BEEN ON AFDC FOR AT LEAST THREE YEARS. PARTICIPANTS WERE OFFERED A JOB FOR A LIMITED PERIOD OF TIME UNDER CONDITIONS OF CLOSE SUPERVISION, GRADUATED STRESS AND PEER SUPPORT.

AFTER EXTENSIVE EVALUATION, SUPPORTED WORK WAS FOUND TO BE AN EFFECTIVE METHOD FOR HELPING WOMEN WHO WERE LONG-TERM RECIPIENTS OF WELFARE ENTER THE LABOR MARKET, WHILE AT THE SAME TIME REDUCING WELFARE COSTS.

MDRC'S FINDINGS SHOWED THAT AFDC WOMEN WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE PROGRAM PERFORMED BETTER THAN THOSE WHO DID NOT IN TERMS OF INCREASED EMPLOYMENT, INCREASED EARNINGS AND REDUCED WELFARE DEPENDENCE. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THESE DIFFERENCES HELD UP CONSISTENTLY THROUGHOUT THE POST-PROGRAM PERIOD.

IT IS ALSO OF INTEREST THAT MANY OF THE WOMEN IN THE AFDC GROUP SOUGHT AND OBTAINED JOBS AND REMAINED EMPLOYED EVEN THOUGH THEIR EARNINGS WERE SUBSTANTIALLY OFFSET BY THE LOSS OF WELFARE BENEFITS. IN ADDITION, THE COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS FOR THE AFDC GROUP REVEALED THAT THE PROGRAM YIELDED CONSIDERABLE NET BENEFIT TO SOCIETY BECAUSE OF THE EARNINGS GAINS OF PARTICIPANTS, THE VALUE OF THE WORK PERFORMED AND THE REDUCTION IN BENEFITS RECEIVED.

FOR ANOTHER GROUP OF WELFARE CLIENTS - THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN ON THE CASELOAD FOR RELATIVELY SHORT PERIODS OF TIME - CAREFULLY CONSTRUCTED INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP JOB

SEARCH PROGRAMS SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED.

MDRC HAS EXAMINED JOB SEARCH PROGRAMS FOR AFDC RECIPIENTS THROUGH ITS RESEARCH ON EXPERIMENTAL WIN PROGRAMS OR LABORATORIES. THIS RESEARCH HAS SHOWN THAT GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL JOB SEARCH STRATEGIES ARE FEASIBLE TO OPERATE AND CAN BE INTEGRATED INTO REGULAR ACTIVITIES OF THE WIN PROGRAM OR OTHER EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR WELFARE APPLICANTS AND RECIPIENTS.

JOB SEARCH RESULTED IN MODEST BUT SIGNIFICANT EMPLOYMENT AND EARNING GAINS FOR PARTICIPANTS. IT CAN BE AN EFFECTIVE APPROACH FOR INDIVDIUALS WHO DO NOT HAVE SUBSTANTIAL BARRIERS TO PARTICIPATION IN THE LABOR FORCE.

MDRC WILL BE LEARNING MORE ABOUT THIS APPROACH AND ABOUT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COMMUNITY WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS THROUGH A MULTI STATE DEMONSTRATION OF STATE WORK/WELFARE INITIATIVES WHICH IS NOW UNDERWAY.

FROM THE COLLECTIVE EXPERIENCE OF PROGRAM OPERATORS AND THOSE WHO ANALYZE PROGRAM RESULTS, WE KNOW A GREAT DEAL ABOUT PROGRAMS THAT DO MAKE A DIFFERENCE. THE CHALLENGE REMAINS TO USE THIS KNOWLEDGE TO CREATE A MORE RESPONSIVE AFDC PROGRAM.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Thank you very much.

Dr. McAdoo, I am very much interested in the statement you made on page 2 of your testimony where you say that "These changing family structures in and of themselves, are not pathological or nonfunctional. All single mother family units are not harmful, just as all two-parent households are not good, as shown by the increasing level of violence and abuse in many of these families. The functionality of a family unit, which can be defined as its ability to meet the expressive and instrumented developmental needs of all family members, and not its particular structure, is the important element that should be the focus of your deliberations."

I am glad you mentioned that because we have heard all morning about the enormous increase in single parent families. Could you elaborate on that a little bit?

Ms. **McAdoo**. Yes, I used those statements trying to avoid the stereotype.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Because there is a stereotype that if there is only the mother, the children are deprived.

Ms. **McAdoo**. The stereotype is that the child will have certain characteristics that will be negative. The mother is expected to have certain characteristics and the child will do poorly. What I am trying to get us to do is look at the diversity of results of being raised and reared within a one-parent home. I think many of the women who testified this morning could be examples of women who found that it was healthier to leave the two-parent home and set up a one-parent household.

Mr. **Donnelly**. It is more the individual circumstance, the categorization is clearly wrong, however.

If there is a male in the home but he is abusive or not attentive to the children that does more damage than if he moves to California.

Ms. **McAdoo**. Yes.

Ms. **Blum**. I agree entirely. I think the work described is really very important, having looked at many protective service cases and also domestic violence cases during my tenure as social services commissioner in New York State.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Can I make a comment about that?

Mr. **Donnelly**. Certainly. You would if I wouldn't let you anyhow.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Right.

I am the result of a single-parent home. My father died when I was 8. I certainly was not deprived. I didn't have as much as other kids. My mother worked hard and there were times I didn't have anything at all. We had an extended family. We had aunts, uncles, and cousins. That attention was very important and I was told I could be and do as much as anybody else and I was and I did and I am here and I am delighted to have had an opportunity to let you people know that as well.

Mr. **Donnelly**. What about the impact of the extended family, the single parent without an extended family? I suspect he or she would be at a disadvantage.

Ms. **Blum**. That would be a target group to try to support. I hope that as your work continues, it will not seem hopeless. In my current position, as I have reviewed the results of Project Redirection for young mothers, it occurred to me that, at a minimum, that mother is eligible for AFDC, medical assistance, food stamps, WIC, WIN, title XX, title IV-E, and public school—if the school system is responsive.

Our real challenge is to train and prepare the workers and the administrators in the system to think in a more holistic way. You heard from the panelists this morning about workers who didn't suggest that day care was available to them. I am certain that there were many other services available that were never mentioned. By targeting our current resources we may be able to get so much more and with the cost effectiveness that you are working to achieve.

I believe that is true for the long-term welfare mother as well because I have observed women who have been able to make it off the rolls.

If we think about grant diversion, the use of public assistance payments to subsidize jobs, and the combination that is possible with JTPA, whatever its deficiencies, we may have the opportunity to focus on certain groups of welfare clients who really want very much to become independent.

Mr. DONNELLY. So realistically the solution to the problem wouldn't only be throwing "*x*" amount of billions of dollars into the present system——

Ms. BLUM. I don't think so.

Mr. DONNELLY. It would be in reality rebuilding and individualizing; they are all individuals with separate and distinct problems; individualizing the present system.

What about the present system in which there is great discrepancy between States across the country? Seems there are more—I would not say they are progressive but maybe more wealthy States provide more assistance to people than others. Should there be a national standard?

Ms. BLUM. I have always believed there should be a national floor leaving discretion for States to be more generous. The benefits in certain States are not acceptable at the present time.

Mr. DONNELLY. Dr. McAdoo, your study clearly shows that the rising tide doesn't lift all boats, does it?

Ms. MCADOO. No, it does not. I wanted to respond to your question about the single mother and extended family.

We have to be very careful also not to use the stereotype that all young mothers have families that are able to support them. Many families just are not able to take on the additional burden. We found that many of the women, about 60 percent of our women, did live totally independent of their extended families. They preferred to live alone. They preferred to be independent. They tended to go back to the extended family during those points of crisis that I mentioned.

One of the things we found out as a result of the changes over that 1 year was that more and more mothers had been forced to go back into the families because they were unable to maintain themselves independently.

Mr. DONNELLY. Ms. Ferraro.

Ms. FERRARO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. McAdoo, referring to your testimony on page 5, bottom paragraph, you say, "However, we did find that almost one-third of the women were no longer employed. It appears that many of them"—back to your group, I guess.

Ms. McAdoo. Yes.

Ms. Ferraro. We found that "it appears that many of them had been directly impacted by the cuts in budgets that were related to job training, day care, and social services. Many of them had been laid off, others had found that even with a job that there was no affordable day care. Many had been forced to go on welfare." Would you be more specific about how that occurred?

Ms. McAdoo. A year earlier all the women had been self-supporting and employed. We found that many had been involved in CETA training and they were cut back and eliminated. We found——

Ms. Ferraro. When CETA was eliminated they were eliminated from the market?

Ms. McAdoo. They were totally out.

Ms. Ferraro. Were they able to find a job elsewhere?

Ms. McAdoo. No, because they were not able to complete their training and they could not get support for placement. We found many of the women who worked were unable to find day care because many of the centers used CETA workers and when they lost those workers they then lost manpower and had to close some of the classrooms that were being used for day care.

Many of the day care costs increased. The women were forced to make very bitter choices. It was particularly hard when a women had a good job and she had to give that job up because she didn't have day care.

We had expected that more of the grandmothers would be involved in taking care of the children while the mothers worked. We found out this was not the case. The grandmothers were themselves in the marketplace and because many of these women had given birth as young teenagers the grandmothers were only about 35 years old, so they were working to support the other members of their families.

I think the testimony of the women agreed with some of the information we received. For instance, many women found that by working they actually took home less than if they had stayed at home on welfare. By the time they paid transportation, child care and paid some of the work-related expenses, they actually earned less than welfare. But they seemed to have a very strong drive not to be dependent. They wanted to take care of themselves, even if they were not financially well off. Maybe it was not cost effective on a dollar-per-dollar basis, but they felt better about being able to take care of themselves. They had a very strong work ethic.

Ms. Ferraro. The strong work ethic is what I was discussing with my colleague from California before, if they were getting less money to feed their kids, what should they do?

Ms. McAdoo. At that point those women were making the decision to work in addition to trying to get training. They had the idea that it may be difficult at this point, but in the future I will have job mobility. If they had gone on welfare their future would have been even more limited.

Ms. FERRARO. Whereas she elected to have less money in order to maintain their homes, but work.

Ms. McADOO. Yes, because they saw that was a temporary situation. And of course the sad thing was that this mobility was totally cut off for many of the women. We found that the job displacement had occurred among both the working class, lower class and a few middle class women. We thought that the ones with the college degrees would have been more secure. But we found that because of the early parenting and their age, their seniority was much lower, whether they were social workers or teachers, and when Baltimore started cutting back in these jobs at both levels, city and State levels, these are the women who lost their jobs.

Ms. FERRARO. This study was completed in March 1983?

Ms. McADOO. Yes.

Ms. FERRARO. Have you done any tracking of those individuals since?

Ms. McADOO. We have been unable to. But I have a summary of the final report I would like to enter for the record.

Ms. FERRARO. Fine, for the record, yes.

[The summary follows:]

EXTENDED FAMILY SUPPORT OF SINGLE BLACK MOTHERS FINAL REPORT

(Harriette Pipes McAdoo, Ph. D., Principal Investigator)

XXII. SUMMARY

Social support networks

The theory of family support that was examined was whether or not those women, who are parenting alone, with greater stress, are more involved in the extended family support systems than those women who perceive themselves as being under less stress. Attributes of the family network were indentified that related to network density, affection for kin, and the kin-help exchange. The hypotheses that were developed from this theory of social support provided by the family only partially supported the hypotheses. Highly stressed women did appear to confide more in their kin and to depend upon more upon relatives for help. Yet at the same time, the stressed mothers found it more difficult to exchange visits with their kin and tended to feel that they were in too much contact with their family members. The stressed mothers also strongly tended to be unhappy with their present family situations.

These data are consistent with the work of Ladner (1969) and Stack (1974) in that these women who were under greater stress will be intimately involved with their family. Yet these women were living independently of their kin. As with McAdoo's earlier (1978) study, the levels of stress were very high for the women. These women who were parenting alone were under great financial strain and needed to go beyond their own resources in order to maintain their family units. As projected by Hill (1971), Billingsley (1968), and McLanahan et al (1981), these supports were probably the major conditions under which they were able to survive.

However the alternate hypothesis to stress and the extended family, that as women are able to come from under the heavy stress usually over years after separations have occurred, or with the increasing maturity and financial stability of the women parenting alone, the active family support becomes less important as the women are able to take more control of their lives. These findings are consistent with that of Colletta and McLanahan in that those women who appear to be able to function more effectively, i.e., are under less debilitating stress, will be able to function well in a more independent stance from the family network system. The women who have managed to become under less stress were those who seldom confided in family members, and those who had fewer members upon whom they depended for help. However, these same women were able to visit with their relatives easily and thus could call upon them for help readily if needed. They tended to be happy with their family situations and felt good about the contact that they did have with their kin. These women lived independent of their extended residential patterns, but they were situated in such a manner that they could easily call upon the family if the stress should become overwhelming. This may have provided a sense of security for the women and their children, yet it freed them from the continual pressure that may be inherent in extended family relations. In other words, the women were able to have the security of social support availability, yet were free of the dependency-inducing relationships that may be fostered. They could keep their family contact at a level that was comfortable for them, thus allowing them to change role models and relationships, as their own needs changed as they went through the stages that follow dissolution of their marriages and the maturity of their children, regardless of their previous marital status.

These findings point to the need to avoid global interpretations of the characteristics of Black extended families, because the interactions are more complex than the family literature would suggest. The earlier defensive writings, of the 1960's and 1970's, were required because of the policy and scientific views that were being placed into action. While these needs still exist, and in fact have become more intensified in the past two years of creeping conservatism, we are in positions to move beyond simple descriptive studies of Black family support networks. It would help us avoid some of the polemics that are so often heard. Further analyses and trimming of the regression models of these data, will lead to even better refinement of the quantifiable components of the family support networks that are particularly supportive for urban mothers and their children.

Practically all of the others felt close to family members and could name at least one person that they could depend upon in times of need. The majority relied upon female relatives and female friends. The contact with relatives was extensive and many of the mothers lived in close proximity to their immediate families.

Social class

The middle-class and working-class mothers closely resembled each other in their interactions with kin and friends. No significant differences were found in the number of kin mentioned nor in the frequency with which they interacted. Working-class mothers' interactions with their friends occurred on a more frequent basis and they were engaged in many more activities. However, we found that middle-class mothers reported longer lists of friends than their counterparts.

In the types of help exchanged, the results indicated that the support networks for emotional support and social activities were larger for middle-class mothers. What is more, the middle-class group was able to provide help to a wider number of people than the group of working-class mothers. When investigated further, it appeared that middle-class mothers who were previously married supported a larger network of family and friends.

Marital status

The never married mothers in our study appeared to be involved in larger social networks and they interacted frequently with their family and friends. The larger networks of the never married mothers could be attributed to the fact that they had significantly larger numbers of persons living in their households. In addition, they were more likely to live in family structures that were simple extended and attenuated extended.

The analyses of types of help exchanged revealed quite different results. Contrary to the above findings, the mothers who had been previously married reported more sources of help than the never married mothers. That is, frequencies of persons giving them material and nonmaterial help outnumbered the never married mothers' helping networks. This, however, does not indicate that one group received more help than the other group. The areas in which the networks were largest were emotional support, repairs, and social activities. But in areas such as financial aid and child care we found no differences between the ever marked and never married groups.

Very few differences, based on marital status, were found in the number of people given help by the single mothers. The ever married mothers gave more people help with clothes/furniture. They also named more friends that they helped, whereas never married mothers named more older persons. In other studies, e.g. Taylor (1982), it was found that higher educated and income persons relied more upon the social networks which was similar to some of the findings in this study.

Women whose children disliked them working were under significantly higher stress: It could be that a reciprocal situation occurred, in that the mothers under greatest stress may have been unable to meet the developmental needs of their children and thus the children began to dislike one of the mothers' roles that may have been seen by the children as one force that was taking their mother away from them.

The important element in the support network and stress is that the women seem to do better when there is a balance between the assistance they were given and that they gave to others. An imbalance appears to be present when there is greater stress. When the mother is obligated to give more than she receives could cause a drain on her limited resources. Likewise, when she is forced to rely on and require more from others than she is able or called upon to return, she then is put in the uncomfortable position of building up obligations that may become impossible to repay. Her need for this imbalanced help may be another signal that her needs are great at this point due to the build-up of pressure. Therefore, the higher stresses may not be due to the obligation that cannot be met, but simply a sign that the needs of the mother are great because of the overload of roles and the demands of single parenting.

Mental health and stress

As a group, the single mothers were generally satisfied with their lives and their roles as mother and worker in spite of their high stress levels. They had positive self-esteems and felt in control of the important events in their lives. The acute and chronic anxiety levels indicated that the single mothers were experiencing moderate amounts of stress. The levels of stress in the past six and over a two-year period revealed that the mothers had experienced a great deal of life changes that could possibly result in mental and physical illnesses. Based on their ratings of stress, money was the cause for intense anxiety.

No marital status or SES were found in the mental health status of the mothers (i.e., self-esteem, life and role satisfaction). Very few differences were found in stress and anxiety. Previously married mothers experienced more stress in legal areas, working-class mothers had experienced more stress events related to their jobs and in parenting. Age was correlated with stress, i.e., older mothers were under less stress than the younger mothers. The older mothers experienced little stress in all areas except legal matters. The perception of stress was highest among mothers who had been married. Perceived stress was not influenced by SES.

Help seeking behaviors

In times of need the mothers typically depended upon themselves to resolve problems. However, depending upon the severity of the conflicts we found that mothers would use different coping strategies. When problems became somewhat unbearable, they indicated that they would cry or sleep. A sizeable number of the mothers sought help from family and friends or spiritual sources. If problems were severe and prolonged, the majority of the sample for the first time, indicated that they would seek external support. The mothers, in general, coped with problems by relying on themselves and engaging themselves in various activities.

When help was needed, mothers first went to their family or friends. They usually sought advice or needed to exchange ideas with their support networks. It was not always material support that mothers needed. The mothers relied heavily upon female relatives and friends.

In spite of the mothers' extensive use of the extended network, they did occasionally seek help from external sources. The utilization of services was not uncommon for this group, but the use of certain professionals such as counselors or psychiatrists was rare. The most needed community services were child care centers, family/individual counseling and financial services. The mothers tended not to be utilizing the community services that would enable them to cope with their stress.

Coping strategies and stress

There are several implications that can be drawn from the results that were related to the resolution of conflicts within the lives of these single mothers. The majority did express the fact that they felt there were conflicts existing between their roles as mother and those related to their job and to their job satisfaction. When these conflicts were reported, almost two-thirds of the women resolved them by using strategies of Reacting Role Behavior. In this strategy the women continued to attempt to meet all of the conflicting demands of their home responsibility, their children, and their jobs. They, in other words, were attempting to be the proverbial "supermoms." This strategy did enable them to cope with the many demands, but they were unable to cope without a great risk to their own mental and physical health. They had selected the one strategy set that had been most closely related to the perpetuation of stress in the lives of the women. By not attempting to make structural role definitions (Type I) or making personal role redefinitions (Type II), they were not effectively managing the conflicting strains in their lives but were simply exerting energy to cope with their situations that could have detrimental effects later on them and their children.

The service implications that would be drawn out of these data would be that these mothers might need to have services provided to them to enable them to be able to become aware of the consequences of the choices they are making. However, most of the women found themselves in positions as single parents to be unable to take some of the elimination tacks that Harrison and Minor (1978) found their married women were able to take. In the earlier study, women who found themselves overloaded as these women were, either eliminated the role of employee, if they were white, or the role of wife, if they were Black and found that they had to continue to work. It is unknown how many of these women are now single because they took the latter route. Nevertheless, these women are still overloaded and since they do not have support from the father for their children that is adequate to allow them to stop work, and since they are unwilling to eliminate the role of parent, even on a temporary basis, they are caught.

The consequences of not providing these women with supportive services will be that they will probably be in greater need of organized social service support at some point in their lives.

Increased economic pressures

An informal follow-up over the telephone was made about a year later and we found, unfortunately, that over one-third were no longer working. Most gave reasons that indicated that the changing economy and the shift in national policies in the funding of supportive programs were most contributive to their unemployment. This level of unemployment was unfortunate, for these were women who were struggling against great difficulty to keep themselves independent of state or federal governmental assistance in the forms of welfare, food stamps, and subsidies. They represented women who did have the motivation to cope with their multiple roles and who were managing to stay afloat, under difficulty, in tight financial times. These were not women who had been beaten by poor finances and limited opportunity into multiple-generational dependence upon the government for survival. Instead they had been able, for the most part, to get some training and to obtain and maintain their employment and were able to maintain their families and households as units that were independent of their families and of governmental assistance. They had clearly shown the characteristic strains of maintaining their families financially, as shown in "Women and Children: Alone and in Poverty", that was co-authored by Diana Pearce and Harriette McAdoo, under the auspices of the National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity (September, 1981).

The reasons that the women gave for their discontinued employment was related to the cuts in federal job training or subsidized programs, such as CETA and others. Another reason frequently mentioned was lack of day care. Several of the day care centers and nursery schools that the mothers of younger children had relied upon had lost their funding, or their workers due to cutbacks in different programs and, therefore, were unable to make adequate and safe day care arrangements for their children, thus forcing them to stop work and go on welfare. The long-range implications are that it will be more costly to subsidize these women and their children by these means than to continue the needed day care services that would allow them to work and become taxpayers themselves. However, the even greater cost will be to the long-term psychological health and physical health problems that can predictably be expected to occur as a result of the stresses of unemployment, underemployment, and lack of preschool eduction for their children. As taxpayers, we will have to eventually subsidise the mental and physical health care of these women. We will also be victims for the lower productivity that will result, the lessened self-esteem of the women and their children, their lower level of achievement and the higher level of juvenile delinquency that tends to result from families who are under this type of chronic stress. Mental health agencies have already begun to report that there have been signficantly higher increases of child abuse and other family-centered violence within home as unemployment levels have increased.

This increase in unemployment has one other unexpected effect on these Black single mothers, that is the lack of employed men who would otherwise be able to enter into legal unions with these women and share the responsibilities and costs of raising these children. It is felt that one of the important reasons that teenage out-of-wedlock births are so high, is that the extremely high level of unemployment among urban Black teen males prevents the marriage of impregnated girls that is common in other ethnic groups when a mistake of this type occurs. The welfare system is designed to prevent these unions from being made legal, for the young mother and her child are able to receive more support if she does not marry. In fact, she often can receive even more support if she is independent of her family, thus removing two very important supports from the lives of young single mothers at a time when it is greatly needed. The extended family support and the continuing support of the father of the child who would do much to alleviate the stresses related to single parenthood.

All of these factors point to the very complicated nature of the issues that are related to single mothering. No one element alone would be able to make a significant change in the overall picture of the single mother and her child. The greatest need is for financial security. This one element is significantly related to every part of her life: prematurity and high death rate of their babies, high level of learning disabilities related to poor prenatal care, poor nutrition, and inadequate health care. Yet the financial strains are interrelated to the other issues of male unemployment, low wages for women who are able to work, inadequate child care, and deficient educations and health care within urban centers. As more and more attention is being paid to the difficulties of working mothers (see *New York Times Magazine*, November 27, 1982) who are fortunate enough to be married and middle- and upper-class status, correspondingly more attention must be given to the supportive needs of working- and lower-middle-class women who are parenting alone.

Ms. **Ferraro**. As a former State commissioner of social services in New York, and New York State has a reputation for establishing relatively generous benefit levels for assistance programs, what problems are caused by the wide divergence between State entry levels?

Ms. **Blum**. The divergence of the benefit levels in the various States really has the greatest impact on clients who are frozen into living situations in States where the very nourishment and shelter of children becomes impossible.

You are right that New York State is viewed a[illegible]latively generous benefits. But even those, as you know, are totally inadequate to support shelter in the urban areas of the State. That despite the fact that a 15-percent increase in the benefit was enacted 2 years ago.

It is always very difficult for me to imagine, based on my observations of New York State families, what it must be like to be a family in Texas or Mississippi where the grants are the lowest.

Ms. **Ferraro**. Do you support a national welfare system with standardized eligibility levels and benefit levels?

Ms. **Blum**. I would support such a system if there were an acceptable floor, taking into account regional differences in costs of living. While this is a very tough question, I believe that this Nation should have such a system. I have studied and learned about the European systems and feel that you tend to get a better support system from region to region when the national commitment is present and visible.

Ms. **Ferraro**. You addressed one thing in your testimony which I think was the complaint of some of the people down here, and that is that the system is large, there are many pieces to it, sometimes the clients don't get the benefits they should and sometimes it is not operating in the way it should.

The problem with it, I think, when I think of New York City—certainly you are the expert on it much more than I—but in a city like New York or State like New York, it is just so big that when you sit down with the programs that might be available and sit down with clients that you have coming in in order to do it the right way, you should probably be able to feed the information to the computer and go down the whole series of programs that might be available to the individual but that system doesn't exist in New York to do that.

Ms. **Blum**. New York has, in fact, implemented such a system in all local service districts except New York City and I hope that the system will be implemented in New York City in the near future as well. In this welfare management system, information on income and family composition is entered into the system which automatically determines for which programs eligibility could be established. The system will also calculate the grant level which is a very complicated process in New York State.

Progress has been slow in New York City because there are 47 or so income maintenance centers and certain adaptations of the welfare management system must occur as the system is put into place.

This sort of support system makes it possible to think of training workers to think not only about income support but also about other basic services such as day care, food stamps, or WIC that could make life viable for the women that we heard from this morning.

It seems to me that all of us have the responsibility to keep working toward that. Congress can be very helpful, for example, in helping to get consistency in the way we define households and certain other terms. Intake workers struggle with such definitions and don't get the credit that they deserve. The programs we have designed are very difficult for them to handle.

Ms. **Ferraro**. How have the Reagan budget cuts affected the women?

Ms. **Blum**. I have tried to stay as informed as I can in my present role. I know that Commissioner Parales has been tracking what has been occurring and the experience in New York State has, I believe, not shown the same level of return to welfare that was described by Dr. McAdoo.

It could be that our grant level is higher, or a number of other factors may be affecting what occurs for these women.

There had been some return to the rolls but nothing of the magnitude that we had expected. For instance, certain 18 year olds became eligible for home relief so they were not cut off. There may have been other such adjustments that made the difference.

Ms. **Ferraro**. So the city compensated where the Federal funds were not available?

Ms. **Blum**. Yes. The State and localities did. I was absolutely determined that we would not cut out medicaid for young women in their early trimesters. That would be foolhardy to say the least and cruel to say the worst.

Ms. **Ferraro**. I want to thank you both for the compassion you have shown with the people, particularly in my city, as commissioner. I thank you.

Ms. **Blum**. Thank you.

Ms. **McAdoo**. Thank you.

Mr. **Donnelly**. Let me ask a final question before you go. What about waste, fraud and abuse?

Ms. **Blum**. Would you like a candid response? I think you should be proud of the welfare administrators in most of the States of this Nation for what they have done to manage these impossible programs.

I would not in any way defend the situation that did exist in the early 1970's.

But I think the quality control effort and the computerization of these programs, has led to something that this Nation should be very proud of and that the public isn't aware of. I believe that public welfare administrators manage far better than most of our corporate executives and I would like to be on the record on that.

Mr. DONNELLY. Dr. McAdoo, do you have such a ringing endorsement?

Ms. MCADOO. Yes, I would totally endorse that.

Mr. DONNELLY. Thank you both very much.

Hopefully as we go through this process, if there seems to be coming one clear relevant point, the point is that the system is not working well, it needs to be individualized and reconceptualized. I will have to work with my colleagues to see if something cannot be done about it.

The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:10 o'clock., the task force adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

○